

2h

No. 2112.45





Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2012 with funding from
Boston Public Library

HAARLEM

THE BIRTH-PLACE OF PRINTING,

NOT MENTZ:

2112.45

BY

J. H. HESSELS,

M.A. CANTAB.

London:

ELLIOT STOCK & Co., 62, PATERNOSTER ROW.

Dec., 1887.

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

5721

B. H.

407.941

Jan 4. 1888

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

CHAP.	PAGE
I. DR. VAN DER LINDE AS AN AUTHOR ON PRINTING - - -	1
II. DR. VAN DER LINDE HAS "MASTERED" THE SUBJECT - - -	5
III. DR. VAN DER LINDE MAKES "RESEARCHES" - - - -	9
IV. MANUSCRIPTS, BLOCK-BOOKS, AND THE FIRST APPEARANCE OF PRINTING - - - - -	13
V. THE EARLIEST PRINTERS ALWAYS MANUFACTURED THEIR OWN TYPE - - - - -	18
VI. THE HABITS OF THE EARLIEST PRINTERS - - - - -	21
VII. THE "COSTERIANA" - - - - -	24
VIII. WERE THE "COSTERIANA" PRINTED AT UTRECHT? - - -	33
IX. UNCERTAINTY AS REGARDS "DATING" THE COSTERIANA - -	37
X. ANOPISTHOGRAPHIC PRINTING; PRINTER'S WASTE; BINDER'S WASTE - - - - -	39
XI. THE "SPECULUM" - - - - -	41
XII. THE "DATE" OF THE COSTERIANA - - - - -	44
XIII. ZELL AND JUNIUS CORROBORATE EACH OTHER - - - -	46
XIV. THE PRINTER OF THE COSTERIANA DID NOT BEGIN AFTER 1471 - - - - -	48
XV. ZELL'S STATEMENT IN THE "COLOGNE CHRONICLE" OF 1499 -	52
XVI. THE HAARLEM TRADITION - - - - -	56
XVII. GUTENBERG WAS NOT THE INVENTOR OF PRINTING - - -	59
XVIII. SUMMARY - - - - -	69

P R E F A C E .

The following chapters are reprinted, with slight modifications, from the "Academy," where they appeared from April 30th to August 13th, 1887.

The whole is the outcome of researches which I have made since the appearance of my work on Gutenberg in 1882, but more especially since last year. For the last four or five years, all those who take an interest in the history of printing had been hoping that Mr. Henry Bradshaw, the late Librarian of the Cambridge University, would write the article Typography for the "Encyclopædia Britannica," and no one hoped this more earnestly than I did. I knew that the question of the invention was sure to be treated by him with impartiality, and that his opinion would be worth having, while I had found the subject attractive, indeed, but so expensive, and absorbing so much time, that I was not sorry to see it in the hands of such a consummate bibliographer as Mr. Bradshaw. But by his sudden death, in February of last year, his task devolved on me.

Before I could attempt to write anything, some very important points required to be cleared up. For instance: I was not prepared to state whom I regarded as the inventor of printing, or where the invention had been made. I certainly did not think that the honour of the invention could be ascribed to Gutenberg, or to Mentz. But the Haarlem tradition had been so ridiculed, and its advocates so mercilessly abused, since 1870, by Dr. Van der Linde, that it required some nerve even to examine it.

While I was reading once more his "Haarlem Legend" (1870) and his "Gutenberg" (1878), a new and elaborate work on the Invention of Printing, by the same author, was announced as about to appear in the course of 1886. According to the prospectus, which Messrs. A. Asher & Co., of

Berlin, issued, this new book would have unprecedentedly great attractions. The author was declared to

"have proved by three epoch-making publications: the "Costerlegend" (1870); "Gutenberg" (1878); "Breviarium Moguntinum" (1884), that he is qualified to treat of this great subject in a conclusive manner. The aim of the new book was to prove, by means of original (!) documents (Quellen), and by a historical-critical method, that the invention is of German origin; that Gutenberg, a citizen of Mentz, produced the art of printing—facts [so says the prospectus] on which the most confused notions have been disseminated, even in very pretentious German works, and which, especially in foreign countries, are opposed again and again, even (!) lately,* after the appearance of Dr. Van der Linde's Gutenberg. The author, a Hollander by birth, was forced (!) to fight against the claims of his own countrymen with destructive (!) weapons, not from want, but on account of patriotism, and in the full sense of his duty (!) to purge (!) the arms of [Holland] from a dark spot, i.e., the usurpation of the glory belonging to the [German] nation, and blind self-glorification. In the new book, plenty (!) of new (!) material will appear; the decisive (!) documents are, for the first (!) time, correctly (!) explained and applied; entirely new ones (!) have been added, and the work has been made accessible to every one by a translation of all the quotations. The publication of this really German-national (!!) work has been made possible by the munificence of the Prussian Ministry of the spiritual, educational, and medicinal affairs, which has contributed a considerable (!) part towards the expenses of its printing."

So says the prospectus. As I had realized that Dr. Van der Linde's "three epoch-making publications" on the invention of printing could not be trusted in any way, and certainly did not show that Gutenberg was the inventor, I was curious to see whether in his fourth book he would make his case so clear that his verdict could be accepted. I was especially curious to know the decisive (!) documents which Dr. Van der Linde would, for the first time, correctly (!) explain and apply. And I was still more curious to see the "entirely new documents" to be added by him.

Alas! when the book appeared, it was but too clear that it was nothing but a rechauffée † of his two previous publications, with such modifications as my own book on Gutenberg had suggested to him. Dr. Van der Linde indeed, declares that he never read my book. But his present treatment (1) of the Strassburg Lawsuit of 1439; (2) of the Letters of Indulgence of 1454; (3) of the 42-line, or Mazarine, Bible; (4) of the Marienthal

* Here Messrs. Asher & Co. specially pointed me out by name, as one who had had the audacity to oppose Gutenberg's claim, though I had, as yet, not done anything of the kind, and merely asked: Was he the inventor of printing?

† The "entirely new documents" amount to nothing more than one item from a Strassburg register, which was supplied to him by the Strassburg Archivist, and which merely shows that Gutenberg resided in that city in 1444.

Press ; (5) of the Mentz printer Friedrich Heumann ; (6) of the Eltville Press ; (7) of the eight books attributed to Gutenberg on the strength of the falsified date in the Darmstadt Prognostication ; (8) of his so-called Gutenberg school which he stretched till far into the 16th century, etc., is so curiously in accordance with my treatment of these points in my book on Gutenberg published in 1882, and so utterly at variance with his own in his Gutenberg of 1878, that it is plain that he must have read my book or at least carefully watched all that has been said about it in various publications. That this is really the case, he incidentally admits himself on two or three occasions, but, with that love for second or third hand information which is so strongly developed in him, he refers to those publications which quote from me rather than to my own book. It would, indeed, have been very strange if Dr. Van der Linde had been able to produce some original work in his new book, whereas, in his two previous publications, he had done nothing but copying from others.

Of course, I do not complain of Dr. Van der Linde having so faithfully copied me in every important point which regards Gutenberg, as my book was published on purpose to correct the errors which he had published on the above eight points. But it is a very curious thing that, although he is under such great obligations to me, he yet abuses me more than anybody else, and not for anything I have written or done, but merely on the strength of little pieces of gossip and some fabrications of his own, which have no connection whatever with my book or with Gutenberg.

However, the fact that he has considered it necessary not to differ from me in any of the eight points mentioned above, which are the chief subjects of which I treat in my book, leads me to think that he will, eventually, also adopt the conclusions of my present book and, in spite of his enormous publications in favour of Gutenberg, repeat, before long, what he publicly uttered in 1866, namely: "that it requires a particular exegetic dexterity to extract from the statement of the "Cologne Chronicle" anything but the confession that the art of printing was invented in Holland before Mentz." (See the "Dutch Spectator," 10th Feb., 1866.)

Dr. Van der Linde's new book consists of eleven hundred large 4to pages, but it contains, so far as I can see, not more than one new piece of information, printed in three lines only, and merely telling us that the tradition of Gutenberg being the inventor of printing is a tradition of the St. Victor Monastery, near Mentz, of which Gutenberg himself had been a lay-member (see his "Geschichte," pp. 895, 897). But, however insignificant

this information may look at first sight, it is of the utmost importance, and Dr. Van der Linde may justly claim the credit of having been the first to draw attention to it. Strange to say, he does not do more than mention it, and evidently has not seen that this information, combined with what we may gather from other items, knocks the whole Gutenberg tradition on the head (see my pp. 67, 68, 78); otherwise he would, probably, not have published his "really German-national" work in favour of Gutenberg.

Seeing, then, that Dr. Van der Linde's new book did not establish that Gutenberg was the inventor of printing, any more than his previous publications, my own course was clear. I felt bound to see how far Dr. Van der Linde's treatment of the Haarlem tradition could be relied upon.

While making researches I felt the want of writing down what I found. My notes expanded into an article, and as I believed that I had treated the subject from an entirely new point of view, which could not be brought before the public in that contracted form which is necessary for a work like the "Encyclopædia Britannica," the Editor of the "Academy" consented, at my request, to insert my article in weekly numbers of his paper. I had written the whole before the printing commenced, because I wished to ascertain beforehand whether there would occur any point in my research which would militate against the opinion, in favour of Haarlem, which had gradually forced itself upon me. Nor was it my intention to republish my articles so soon after their appearance in the "Academy," as their publication was begun with no other object than to invite criticism and to use, at some future time, all remarks that might be made in the writing of some more complete work on the subject. Remarks have, indeed, been made on certain of my arguments, but they have all enabled me to strengthen them and to make them more clear and decisive, without compelling me to modify or omit any of them. I myself had overlooked some very important points in favour of Haarlem and against Gutenberg, which deserved to be known, so that I have no hesitation in publishing my essay in a separate form, at the suggestion of all those with whom I had an opportunity of speaking or writing about them.

In 1882, in my work on Gutenberg, I placed on the title the question: "Gutenberg: Was he the Inventor of Printing?" but I was not able to answer that question further than to say that there was sufficient evidence of Gutenberg having been a "printer," but not of his having been the "inventor of printing." I now endeavour to answer that question in the negative. In 1882, I was still under the impression that, in 1468, the

people at Mentz had begun to open their mouths regarding the "invention" of printing and even regarding its inventor, though there had been absolute silence, at Mentz and in Germany, from 1454 to the middle of 1468, on these points, in the midst of great publicity as to the art existing there. I now show, on pp. 63-65, that this impression was owing to a wrong interpretation of the colophons of the *Grammatica and Justinianus* of 1468, which I had derived from Dr. Van der Linde, M. Madden, etc., without seeing myself the right explanation at the time. There is, therefore, no earlier Mentz testimony as to a Mentz invention of printing than that of 1476 (see p. 68, note *), therefore twenty-two years after printing had been there in full operation. So far the *argumentum e silentio*.* On pp. 65-66, I show what value can be attached to the Italian testimony of 1468 (the very first that exists) as to an invention of printing in Germany. On pp. 66-68, I explain not only that the letter of Fichet of 1472 is valueless for the Gutenberg claims, but also that it materially assists us in tracing the origin of those claims, as certain circumstances connected with that letter, show that it is nothing more than the publication of a rumour, which can be traced to the St. Victor Monastery near Mentz, of which Gutenberg himself had been a lay member, so that in reality the rumour must have originated in some boasting utterances of Gutenberg himself. In following up this clue to the origin of the Gutenberg tradition, I show, on p. 67, that all the further testimonies in favour of Gutenberg, marshalled in such a formidable array, by Dr. Van der Linde in his new book, really amount to nothing more substantial than (a) a repetition, in 1504 and 1505, of that same rumour of the St. Victor Monastery, by a relative of Gutenberg, Ivo Wittig, one of its chief officers; (b) some utterances, in verse, in 1494 and 1499, by three Heidelberg professors, all inspired by another relative of Gutenberg.

In short, I believe I may say that those, who wish to maintain that Gutenberg is the inventor of printing, will be under the necessity of explaining, how printing could have been fully and openly carried on in its alleged birthplace, Mentz, in 1454, by two printers, the alleged inventor included, and could have continued to be fully and openly carried on and be advertised there, for more than twenty-two years (1454-76), during fourteen of

* Even in 1475 Peter Schæffer, in publishing the *Codex of Justinianus*, does not think it expedient to say more than that the art of printing had been granted to "our time," for he says that he had completed the *Codex in nobili urbe Maguncia non atramenti calamo cannavæ, sed arte impressoria (qua quidem etsi antiquitas divino non digna est visa iudicio; nostra nichilominus tempestate indulta)*.

which the alleged inventor himself lived and, perhaps, worked there (1454-68), without any of those who must have known, and ought to and would have spoken, if printing had been invented there, saying one word about it, not even the inventor himself, though he was robbed and maltreated by two men, who continued to reap the benefit and the glory of "his invention," and to advertise it for more than fourteen years under his very eyes and nose. The worshippers of Gutenberg will further have to explain why, from 1468 to 1505, we do not hear of any more solid testimonies in favour of their hero than that of Paris of 1472 (= rumour of the St. Victor Monastery = Gutenberg's boast), that of Heidelberg of 1494 and 1499 (= a relative of Gutenberg = Gutenberg's boast), and that of Ivo Wittig of 1504 and 1505 (= a relative of Gutenberg = St. Victor Monastery = Gutenberg's boast).

As regards the Holland and Haarlem claims, its most important features have been so buried by Dr. Van der Linde under all sorts of sophisms, suppositions, gibes and jeers, that I have not been able to touch more than two or three of the most salient points in his attack on them, and I confess that I do not think it worth my while to refute him in every particular. I admit that I wish for more information regarding the person of Lourens Janszoon Coster of Haarlem, and his residence and career there. But Dr. Van der Linde, with all his ridicule and abuse, has not been able to show more than that some minor circumstances in Coster's life are incompatible with some details of Junius' account (see p. 58). When we consider, however, that nearly all the bibliographical and typographical details on which Junius, without knowing anything of bibliography and typography as we do now, or seem to do, based his account in 1568, have absolutely been substantiated and confirmed by discoveries (see p. 47) extending over more than three centuries after Junius' period, we may well forgive him minor inaccuracies, especially when we consider that these inaccuracies would be wholly removed by merely reading 1452 instead of 1442 in Junius' text (see pp. 58 and 78).

Those who care to read my essay attentively, will see that I do not base my advocacy of the Haarlem claims upon any single piece of evidence or testimony, unless it be corroborated by various other circumstances, independent testimonies and pieces of evidence, which all lead to the same conclusion. For instance, I explain most distinctly on pp. 54, 55, that Ulrich Zell's statement in the "Cologne Chronicle" of 1499, however strong it may be in itself, would have no value whatever

in my eyes, if never any Donatuses had been discovered that could, on bibliographical grounds, be said to be those alluded to by him. I even point out, on p. 54, that I would reject Zell's testimony, if we had no more than one Donatus to fit into his account, as he speaks in the plural: of the Donatuses. I may go further and say that I should reject Zell's testimony even if he had based it on Donatuses seen by him, but never seen again by anybody else. But we know that the Donatuses on which the claims of Holland are based and must be based, were only beginning to come to light in the course of last century. Zell, therefore, spoke from knowledge, or from recollection of what did happen or what was being said at Mentz in the earliest days of printing there.

I further explain, on pp. 46-48, 56, that Ulrich Zell's testimony, though it is very strong, would have no value in my eyes if it were not corroborated by some other independent testimony. This corroboration is undoubtedly found in the account of Hadrianus Junius, which is, as we know, written independently of the "Cologne Chronicle," but it bases the Haarlem claims on books which are printed in the identical type (i., see pp. 27, 28) used for the Donatuses which we must fit into Zell's account. I point out distinctly, on p. 55, that I would reject Junius' testimony if the books on which he based the Haarlem claims were not printed in the type of those Donatuses. And, as a matter of course, if Junius' testimony had to be rejected on that ground, that of Zell would have no value either, if the Donatuses, which we must fit into his account, were not printed in the types of the Speculum and the earliest Doctrinales.

On the other hand, speaking as bibliographers, the theory or opinion that the Dutch Donatuses, printed in type i. (see p. 27 sq.), were not printed before 1471-1474, might pass very well, and be even adopted, if there existed no Mentz Donatuses, which, on bibliographical grounds, must be ascribed to the period 1450-1456. But, having these, I do not see how comparative bibliography, worthy of the name, could pronounce the Mentz Donatuses to be some twenty years earlier than those printed in Holland (see pp. 45, 46, 70, 71, 76 note). And when once we conclude that the Mentz and the Dutch Donatuses must be contemporaries, I do not see how we could possibly think of rejecting the testimonies of Zell and Junius, and the entries of the Abbat of Cambray.

From this bibliographical point of view, I suggest (p. 71) to place an interval of eighteen months between each of the twenty editions of the

Costerian Donatuses that we know, whereby, reckoning backwards from about 1474, beyond which we cannot go, we reach the year 1445, as that in which their printer might have begun his work. This interval is, of course, wholly arbitrary. But no one will deny that we must assume some interval between each edition. And as a proposal, to place an interval of one day between each edition, would be just as arbitrary as that of one week, or one month, or any other period, I choose that of eighteen months, because such a calculation has the merit, not only of being possible, reasonable and probable, but of bringing all the historical evidence that we have in perfect harmony with the bibliographical condition of the Costeriana.

As regards the minor details of Junius' account, I have alluded to them, on pp. 56-58, 78, without discussing them at great length. It seems to me rather hard to demand from an historian of the sixteenth century, even if he had been a printer and bibliographer, strict accuracy in every particular of an account of the invention of printing (which was, after all, only one incident among hundreds contained in his Batavia, occupies no more than three pages in that work, and took, perhaps, no more than an hour to be written down), when we consider that an author like Dr. Van der Linde, provided with all the resources of modern civilization and bibliography, has only succeeded in presenting us with a few correct particulars, after having studied the subject for nearly thirty years, and after having be-printed more than two thousand pages, and that even those correct particulars are, for the most part, copied from another author. There are, indeed, some features in Junius' account which are open to attack. There is first his allegation, or supposed allegation, that the Dutch edition of the Speculum is printed with wooden types. It seems that Junius meant to say that that work was so printed. But the point is immaterial, as the question of the invention of printing does not turn upon the material of the types, but upon their movability. There is secondly, his allegation that Coster's types and tools were stolen by a German, who, within a year after that event, printed with them at Mentz. This point is of some importance to the controversy, and it is contradictory to Zell's allegation that the first Mentz printer conceived the idea of the new art by merely seeing the Donatuses printed in Holland. But I do not see how any one could undertake to prove or disprove Junius' allegation, so long as we have not found anything about it. I have already, on more than one occasion, shown that, as the case stands at present, no researches worthy of the name have as yet been made. And to demonstrate the impracticability of the theft, as Dr. Van der Linde does, by a picture representing Samson carrying

the gates of Gaza on his shoulders, merely betrays his ignorance of the state of the art in its infancy, when the whole apparatus of a printing-office, at least its most material portion, could have been carried off by a well-developed lad. All that we can say in connection with Junius' allegation on this point is, that hitherto no tract or tracts of Petrus Hispanus, printed in Coster's types, have been found. But of the Doctrinale we have no less than four editions printed in these types (see p. 28).

*As to Junius' other allegations: thirdly, that Coster was a grandfather when he invented printing; fourthly, that Cornelis the bookbinder was an apprentice of Coster, there would be some difficulty if we had to accept Junius' year, 1442, as that of the first printing at Mentz with Coster's types, for in that case we should have to assume that he indicates 1440 as the year of Coster's invention and 1441 as that of the theft. The calculation about Coster, who does not seem to have been too old, in 1483, to leave Haarlem, is not so wholly improbable as it appears to Dr. Van der Linde. Nor would the case of Cornelis the bookbinder be so hopeless as Dr. Van der Linde says it is. Cornelis was not buried till 1522; Junius speaks of him as a man of no less than eighty years of age, but Junius does not say that he died as an octogenarian. He describes him as a subminister of Coster at the time of the theft. "Subminister" may mean a "lad," an "apprentice," and Cornelis could have been this in 1441, if we assume that he was over ninety when he died in 1522. But, as I have pointed out on p. 58 and above, Junius' account will be found far more harmonious in all its details and with all that we know of the history of printing, if we simply read "1452" instead of "1442" in his text. I think it deserves to be noticed that just about the time that Lourens Janszoon Coster is said to have terminated his residence at Haarlem (in 1483: always assuming that Dr. Van der Linde's figures are correct), we find the blocks of the *Speculum* cut asunder and used (1481, one block; 1483, the remaining) for other purposes than those for which they had been employed in earlier years. Moreover, in the very same year (1483) that Coster leaves Haarlem, Jacob Bellaert begins his career as printer there. Are these coincidences without any meaning?*

As regards the so-called frauds of Koning, De Vries, Noordziek, and "every other Costerian" of which Dr. Van der Linde speaks with such pleasure and such wearisome reiteration, I doubt whether he would be able to substantiate any of his charges, even in his most serious moments. I do

not think it worth while to dwell upon these points. The authors just mentioned have certainly erred in a good many particulars. But no one of the Costerian authors, whom Dr. Van der Linde unceasingly charges with dishonesty, forgery, falsification, etc., has as yet gone so far as to make the public believe that he had made "researches," and to publish afterwards, as the result of his own researches, the mere blunders of the accused persons (see p. 9 sqq.). Certain it also is, that in the case of Coster and the Haarlem claims no such deliberate forgeries have been perpetrated as those which have come to light in the Gutenberg case. Nor is there any necessity for Costerians to resort to forgeries; their case is too strong; the bare truth will help them on much better.

J. H. HESSELS.

Cambridge,

29th October, 1887.

P.S.—On page 32 I speak of the *imposition*, which bibliographers have observed in the *Abecedarium* attributed to Coster, and I argue that there can be no question of such "imposition," as the little work appeared to have been printed page for page, like all other early printed books. I was led into this contradiction by M. Holtrop's fac-simile, on pl. 12, of his *Monuments Typogr.*, where the *Abecedarium* is figured as consisting of *four leaves*, whereas M. Holtrop, in describing (p. 16) the book, speaks also of *two sheets* (= *four leaves*). As I had always found M. Holtrop's work accurate and clear, it seemed to me certain that there could be no question of imposition. But Mr. E. Gordon Duff, of Oxford, to whom I am indebted for other valuable observations, called my attention, a few days ago, to Meerman's *Origines Typogr.*, Vol. i., p. 76, note k, where it is said, that "when Enschedé discovered the *Abecedarium*, it was *in one sheet*, but it was found impossible to get it off from the boards on which it was pasted, without cutting it in half." This, of course, makes it clear that we really have here a case of *imposition*. As I have built no arguments whatever upon the *Abecedarium*, the withdrawal of my contradiction on p. 32 does not effect anything in my book. I may, however, say that, in my opinion, the "imposition," observed in the *Abecedarium*, could hardly be an objection to its being regarded as a product of the infancy of printing; for imposition was probably not unknown to the earliest printers, but merely avoided by them on account of the small quantity of type which they had at their disposal, which compelled them to print their books page for page. But as the text of the eight pages of the *Abecedarium* hardly required more type than was necessary for one ordinary quarto page, there was no reason to avoid imposition in this case.

HAARLEM NOT MENTZ.

CHAPTER I.

DR. VAN DER LINDE AS AN AUTHOR ON PRINTING.

THE third and (let us hope) last volume of Dr. Anton Van der Linde's new work on *The Invention of Printing* appeared a few months ago at Berlin.* When we look at the three large quarto tomes, occupying together more than eleven hundred pages, and remember that the same author published, not so long ago (in 1878), a large octavo volume of eight hundred closely-printed pages on the same subject, and had already issued, in 1870, two editions of a work dealing with only the half of the subject (the Haarlem tradition alone), we are involuntarily reminded of the Arabian flute player of the Greek proverb, who, after he had been hired to play for one drachm, could hardly be persuaded by four such coins to be silent.

It is an unfortunate feature in Dr. Van der Linde's works on the invention of printing that what should form their most essential part—namely, a *bibliographical* treatment of the subject—is singularly unreliable, or altogether wanting. This feature is even more marked in the present than in any of his previous publications. The remainder of the book, that is to say, its polemical part, bears undoubtedly traces of talent; but it cannot benefit anyone much, as it is nothing but a needlessly discursive repetition, for the *fourth* time, of the mistakes and errors of judgment of previous authors on the subject; repetitions which Dr. Van der Linde evidently writes down under the agreeable impression that he himself never makes any mistakes at all.

Therefore, so far as I can see, his new book, though it is called a *History of the Invention of Printing*, merely shows us how that history should *not* be written. It certainly is not worth reviewing. But, as it appears to be regarded in Germany as a “national” work, and the author openly proclaims that he has settled the question once for all in favour of Gutenberg (which, by the way, he has been proclaiming these last eighteen years, without any appreciable results, except among a few persons who blindly adopt his conclusions), and as there is, in my opinion, still a good deal to be said in favour of a

* *Geschichte der Erfindung der Buchdruckkunst.* Von Antonius Von der Linde. 3 Bde. 4^o. (Berlin, 1886: Asher.)

Haarlem invention and against the claims of Gutenberg, I will venture to make a few remarks, which will, I hope, lead those who read them, and who are in no hurry, to suspend at least their judgment.

I will approach my task, not with that "demoniacal force of internal enthusiasm" which drew Dr. Van der Linde towards the subject (see his *Geschichte*, preface), but "sine ira et studio," always weighing and balancing, so far as it is in my power, all that may be said for or against any point that requires to be considered.

I think it necessary to begin by pointing out the true nature of Dr. Van der Linde's three works on printing, in order to show that books of that kind are little calculated to settle intricate disputes.

It is known with what enthusiasm Dr. Van der Linde's *Haarlem Legend* was received in 1870. Ugly rumours as to recent discoveries of very serious errors and defects in the genealogy of the reputed Haarlem inventor had led people, during the previous two or three years, either to pour ridicule upon the Haarlem claim, or to ask for a more searching inquiry into the whole matter. At this critical moment Dr. Van der Linde appeared on the scene, in 1869. Everybody considered him to be the man to make researches, and everybody thought that he was making them. After a short delay he wrote, in the course of 1870, weekly articles in the *Dutch Spectator*, arguing, to the great satisfaction of himself and a good many others, that there was no foundation for the Haarlem claim, and apparently basing his arguments on "originals," on "documents," and on "registers," and enforcing them by very coarse and scurrilous abuse of every Dutchman and every foreigner who had ever spoken or written a single word about the subject that did not please him. A second (and revised) edition of the *Spectator* articles was at once called for in Holland, and issued in the same year, under the title, "*The Haarlem Legend of the Invention of Printing, critically examined by Dr. Anton Van der Linde.*" The book was immediately translated into German and French. I, myself, was so struck by its apparent excellence that I translated it into English. Mr. Bradshaw was so anxious to see such a translation appear that he contributed £15 towards its expenses; and Mr. Blades, being no less desirous to become fully acquainted with the Haarlem story, printed and published my English version in 1871, and the claims of a Haarlem invention of printing seemed demolished for ever.

Meantime, Dr. Van der Linde had turned his back upon his native country, pretending that by his *Haarlem Legend* he had so mortally offended the Dutch that they made the country too hot for him, and compelled him to go into exile. No one could be surprised if the Dutch had really acted as Dr. Van der Linde represented them to have done. He had, indeed, abused his country and his countrymen in a manner which every nation would, and should, resent. But it is no secret that the causes of Dr. Van der Linde's departure from Holland stand in no connexion whatever with his writings on the Haarlem claim, but are to be looked for in himself alone. Nay, the Dutch, so far from showing any ill feeling towards Dr. Van der Linde, have actually altered their school-books in accordance with his views. But he succeeded in persuading the Germans that his courage in saying that Gutenberg was the inventor of printing had cost him his "home" and his "property." They felt bound to indemnify him, and he was appointed librarian at Wiesbaden.

This brief account of Dr. Van der Linde's presence in Germany shows at once that we have no longer to do with a free man, but with one who could not, even if he would, abandon Gutenberg. And so completely is Dr. Van der Linde enchained by this peculiar position, that he always endeavours to ignore, or obscure, or conceal, or shout down whatever might be said in favour of the Haarlem claim. As regards his marvellous activity in pouring forth volume after volume on bibliography, and more especially on the invention of printing, subjects which he seems to labour in vain and in vain to master, even in their most elementary details, it is best explained by a little story which was told me on the Continent last January by a gentleman of undoubted veracity, who had, in turn, heard it from another person, to whom Dr. Van der Linde had himself told it, namely: The Wiesbaden people live in that happy state of ignorance, or of omniscience, that they do not require a library. And yet Wiesbaden does possess a royal library, which is endowed with an annual income and a regular staff, with an "Oberbibliothekar" at its head. This latter post is now held by Dr. Van der Linde; and, if he chose to do so, he might spend his life in an "otium cum dignitate" style, in common with the other members of the staff, as no reader ever enters their library. But, feeling that idleness would be demoralising to his subordinates, Dr. Van der Linde has hit upon the plan of *compiling* books in order to keep his staff employed in supplying him with the necessary works. In this work of compilation he is so successful that, during the decade of his librarianship, he has been able to issue two heavy books on Gutenberg, besides several other works which we need not mention here, but of which each by itself, if done properly, would almost have required a life-time. This result is no doubt gratifying to Dr. Van der Linde himself; whether it is equally gratifying to the public remains to be seen.

The above story would have no importance in the ordinary course of life; but, placed side by side with the account of Dr. Van der Linde's presence in Germany, and some other circumstances which will be stated below, they fully explain the depressing influences which have reduced a man, who, under favourable conditions, might have become a very fair author, to the level of a very indifferent compiler. Thus we see him, almost before his *Haarlem Costerlegend* had had time to become known anywhere, issue a large octavo volume of eight hundred pages, under the title, *Gutenberg: Geschichte und Erdichtung aus den Quellen nachgewiesen*. Stuttgart, 1878.

He was bold enough to begin the book by stating falsely that "it contained his personal *Kulturkampf*, which in its consequences had cost him his home and property," while the abuse of his opponents was, if possible, carried to even greater length than in his *Haarlem Legend*. Immediately after its appearance the book was described as Dr. Van der Linde's "magnum opus." Again I became mixed up with the work, as I was invited and undertook to give an account of it for the *Printing Times and Lithographer*. At first sight the learning displayed in the book appeared to me even more stupendous than that which I had found, or thought to have found, in the *Haarlem Legend*. But I very soon saw that the eight hundred large octavo pages were nothing but a tissue of old stories, statements and opinions, copied and transcribed, at *second, third, and fourth* hand, from all sorts of authors, and by

preference, as it were, from the most insignificant, without the slightest attempt at verifying even the most important statements. The researches that I endeavoured to make to supplement Dr. Van der Linde's shortcomings were published in a separate book in 1882, under the title, *Gutenberg: Was he the Inventor of Printing?* I may be pardoned if I quote a few passages from what I then said about his work. I said—

“It was clear that Dr. Van der Linde had intended, in the first place, to write a book on himself, and that Gutenberg occupied only a secondary place in his work. . . . It is singular that Dr. Van der Linde, who complains that people often write books on the principle of ‘taking three books and making a fourth of it,’ should have compiled his *Gutenberg* entirely on this principle. . . . I cannot believe that he left his study, at any time, for even half a minute, for the purpose of research. . . . To quote from him without verification is out of the question. . . . That he did not feel disposed for the labour through which I have gone, is not surprising. But it is matter for amazement that his book, which I have found wanting in *every particular* regarding the main question, should have been written in such a tone of authority and decision, and with such remarkable intolerance of everything that Dr. Van der Linde does not approve. His vehemence in speaking of his opponents’ mistakes, or errors of judgment, is never agreeable; but when we consider that he has fallen into as many mistakes as any of his predecessors, and *imagined* a great deal more than any one of them, and yet had far better opportunities for obtaining trustworthy information, his vehemence becomes a phenomenon which I leave to others to explain. . . . From taking all his documents at *second, third, or fourth* hand, and rarely telling his readers on what authority he himself prints any single document, and from not investigating a single point in the whole question, his book presents, as it could hardly fail to present, a more complete chaos on the subject than any of its predecessors.”

I further stated that

“I had avoided all direct reference to the tradition of a Haarlem invention of printing, because, having no opportunities at present to make researches in this direction, I feel bound to abide by the results which Dr. Van der Linde made known in 1870. I have never made any thorough examination of the Haarlem question; but such inquiries as I have made have led me to believe that the Haarlem claim cannot be maintained. At the appearance of Dr. Van der Linde’s *Haarlem Legend* in 1870, I was so struck by its excellence that I translated the work into English. Now that I have made a thorough examination of his work on Gutenberg, and have found this book so singularly unreliable, I should wish to go over the ground by which he reached his results with respect to the Haarlem question. Dr. Van der Linde appears to be most easily led away by what he *reads*, if only it coincides with his views. He believes, for instance”

I cannot lay stress enough upon the last quotation, for Dr. Van der Linde’s book on Gutenberg was so poor, so entirely devoid of research or anything that looked like competency in dealing with an intricate historical subject, that it could not but severely shake the confidence placed in his *Haarlem Legend*. And I believe that now, after the lapse of five years, I shall be able to show that that confidence was wholly misplaced.

That Dr. Van der Linde himself did not believe in the value of this book on Gutenberg is sufficiently proved by the fact that, almost at the very time of its publication, he wrote to me that he was “re-writing

the subject, and on a grand scale, for which he required State support, and hoped to receive this from the [German] Emperor." This new book, paid for by the German Empire, is at present before us. It exceeds, if possible, the author's previous publications in its abuse of all persons who happen to disagree with him. One or two examples will suffice to show the scurrilous and inexpressibly childish nature of that abuse. C. A. Schaab, who published in 1830 a work of three octavo volumes on the invention of printing, is called by a pun upon his name "Sehaabskopf" (Sheepshead); and yet Sehaab's book is not worse than Dr. Van der Linde's own, only the latter's name does not lend itself so readily to a similar pun. Dr. Campbell, the Librarian of the Royal Library at the Hague, is compared to a "vagabond." The author's love for inserting statements without verifying them seems to have visibly increased. So after having said, in one place, that he never read my book on Gutenberg (an assertion which seems hardly credible, as he could scarcely have arrived at all my bibliographical results in an independent way), he yet represents me, apparently on the strength of some German newspaper article, as having said that Hans Jacob von Sorgenloeh was the inventor of printing, which, of course, I never did. So again, in a foot-note, he says that I was led round and feasted at Mentz by a priest for a whole month; the fact being that I was at Mentz only from one Friday afternoon till the following Sunday evening; and, as regards the priest, I only saw one for half-an-hour in the Mentz Library. It is, of course, needless to dwell upon these and a multitude of other equally preposterous things which have done service to swell his so-called history of printing.

CHAPTER II.

DR. VAN DER LINDE HAS "MASTERED" THE SUBJECT.

OF the eleven hundred pages of his book, Dr. Van der Linde has taken more than six hundred and fifty to demonstrate, for the fourth time, how dreadfully wrong former authors have been with respect to the *date* of the invention, the *inventor*, and the *types* used by the early printers. And, after having occasionally assured us that he (Dr. Van der Linde) has by this time *mastered* the subject, and now fully understands it (*see* his preface), he is good enough to tell us that "in 1450 Gutenberg began to invent printing with movable types, and that the Germans should prepare for a grand celebration of the event in 1950."

As regards Dr. Van der Linde's assurances that he has "mastered the subject," I very much doubt whether any one will believe him. At least, to me it appears that he has no more mastered the subject at present than he had in 1870. Let us take, as a typical instance, his interpretation of Hadrianus Junius's famous account of the Haarlem invention, in his *Batavia*, published at Leiden in 1588. Dr. Van der Linde himself tells us, on p. 88 (note 1, line 7) of his *Haarlem Legend*, that he has examined that account a *hundred times*, which, I think, ought to be sufficient for mastering a few lines of very clear Latin. Well, Junius relates (p. 255) that Lourens Janszoon Coster "coepit faginos

eorties principio in literarum typos conformare, quibus inversa ratione sigillatim chartae impressis versiculum unum atque alterum animi gratia duebat."

In 1870 Dr. Van der Linde translated this passage thus (*Haarlem Legend*, p. 61):—"He began to cut letters in the bark of a beech, and printed these letters reversed (*sigillatim*) on paper, and thus made, out of amusement, some lines." It is clear that he took *sigillatim* to mean *reversed*; but, in order to make his meaning still clearer, he assures us, on p. 79, that "*sigillatim* indicates only inverted printing," and once more, on p. 110, that "Coster printed his letters reversed (*sigillatim*) on paper." How he would explain "inversa ratione" he does not say. In 1878, Dr. Van der Linde had read a few more books, and made some progress in interpretation; he, therefore, treats us (on p. 357 of his *Gutenberg*) to a note on the word *sigillatim*, giving us to understand that it was derived from *sigillum*, and that Junius, by using this word, had been influenced in his narrative by the *annulus* of Bergellanus's account. "Therefore," says he, "either reversed like a seal, or *singulatim*, singly, as is argued by the Costerians. Bark of a tree, however, does *not* admit such an explanation of separate letters." He returns once more to the word *sigillatim* in his new book (I., pp. 235, 236); and, having now *mastered* the whole subject, he hesitates no longer, but tells us: "*Sigillatim*, like a seal, not, as the later Costerians wish that Junius might have written, *singulatim*, one by one to form separate letters from the bark of a tree is hardly practicable." Thereupon he quotes several lines of learned, but wholly irrelevant, matter, which we need not repeat here, but which induces him to represent Junius as saying that L. J. Coster cut (not separate letters, but) *whole lines* (*versiculum unum atque alterum*) of text from the bark of a tree (*see* p. 236, note 9). This nonsense deserves no refutation; he that knows even a little Latin will perceive that it is entirely against Junius's account. And, as regards *sigillatim*, whatever Dr. Van der Linde may like to say, his inexperience of Latin and of the peculiarities of Latin spelling has led him astray; the word stands for *singillatim*, one by one, *singly, separately*. In Junius's time, and centuries before him, this spelling without the *n* was customary (*cf.* the dictionaries of Forcellini, Du Cange, Lewis and Short, &c.). It is, moreover, plain from Junius's account that he could only mean *singillatim*, one by one, singly, separately; for he is clearly speaking of the element of movability in the new invention ("typis inversa ratione sigillatim, *one by one*, chartae impressis versiculum unum atque alterum *duebat*") and *sigillatim* (by way of a seal) would be an absurdity by the side of "inversa ratione."

Now, as Dr. Van der Linde tells us in one place that he has examined Junius's account *a hundred times*,* and in another place (p. 235) tells us that the passage, in which the word *sigillatim* occurs, is a decisive one, we can realise how trustworthy his whole book must be if, with respect to such an account and such a passage, he remains

* It is, I think, curious that in his *Gutenberg* (p. 392) he speaks of a man who confessed to have read Junius's account *twenty* times and never to have mastered it, by which confession he had, says Dr. Van der Linde, erected to himself a "brilliant *testimonium stupiditatis*." What "testimonium" does Dr. Van der Linde think he has erected to himself by reading Junius's account a *hundred* times and never mastering it?

in the dark for more than eighteen years. Such a state of things must be expected from an author who loves to fill his books with Latin quotations, and yet appears to understand that language so little that even in his present book, after he has been at the subject for twenty years, there is, I believe, not one Latin quotation without some grievous error, not even among such as consist of two or three words only.* But I need not say that such a state of things is rather fatal to an author who pretends to treat the history of the invention from an *exegetical* and historical point of view.

To Dr. Van der Linde's failure in this direction we may add his failure whenever he attempts to describe the productions of the early presses bibliographically. I will only call attention to *two* such attempts found together on two pages. On p. 919, speaking of the *Vocabularius Ex quo*, printed at Eltville in 1472, he says—

“Another novelty concerns the arrangement of the form; the *Vocabularius* of 1472 is no longer printed in quires of 10, but alternately in quires of 8 and 12 (therefore of 2×4 and 3×4) leaves.”

This mode of printing is, indeed, a novelty and it stands altogether alone in the annals of printing. But we need not trouble ourselves much about it, for it arises merely from Dr. Van der Linde's inexperience in bibliography. The first quire (*a*) of the book consists of 12 leaves; but the next twelve quires (*b* to *n*) consist each of 10 leaves; *o* and *p* of 8 leaves each; *q* of 10, and *r* of 8 leaves, making together 166 leaves. Dr. Van der Linde has evidently missed some leaf when he started on his interesting collation; for when a book is divided into quires of 10 leaves, such an inattention unavoidably leads an inexperienced bibliographer to think that he has a book of alternate quires of 12 and 8 leaves before him.

The other instance of Dr. Van der Linde's failure as a bibliographer is found on the same p. 919, where he says that the fourth edition of the *Vocabularius Ex quo*, printed at Eltville by Nicolaus Bechtermünz is dated “December 19, 1477.” Hitherto we knew only of an edition finished on the day of St. Thomas the Apostle—that is to say, December 21, 1477. When we turn to the next page (920) to see whether Dr. Van der Linde gives further details, we find him print the colophon and the lines in which the date occurs in this way: “Sub anno Mcccclxxvii. ipso die sancti Thome Apostoli quod fuit Sabbato die xxix. mensis Decembris.” Now, if that were correct, Dr. Van der Linde ought to have said (on p. 919) that the book was dated 29 (not 19) December, 1477; and he should also have remarked that the colophon was wrong in placing the day of Thomas the Apostle on December 29, as it falls on December 21. But, it will scarcely be believed, “xxix.” is *not* in the colophon at all, and ought not to be there, and has simply been stuck in by Dr. Van der Linde himself. The printer says that the book “was completed in 1477, on the day of St. Thomas the Apostle

* In his *Gutenberg* (p. 156) he is quoting from the Colophon of *Justinianus* of 1476, where, he says, Mentz is called “*Inventrix Climatriaque prima artis impressoriae*.” He prints the same phrase once more in the same work (p. lxiv.) as “*impressoriae artia inventrix eliminatriaque*,” adding the word *climatria* between brackets, by way of correction. Of course the word is *climatriæ*. I might fill several pages with examples of this kind.

(therefore December 21), which was a Sabbath* day of the month of December." It is easy to explain how Dr. Van der Linde came to stick this wrong "xxix." into his text. In 1878 he was still unacquainted with the mediæval manner of naming and describing dates, as is clear from all the dates in his *Gutenberg* being wrong. Since then he has been taking lessons on this point, and in his present book he talks very learnedly on the subject. But we know by this time that it takes Dr. Van der Linde a good many more years than eight to master any subject, and so we see him in 1886 mistake the day (xxixth December) of Thomas of Canterbury for that of Thomas the Apostle, and, by a further mistake, insert that day into his quotation from the colophon, forgetting, in the meantime, that on the previous page he had spoken of the day as December 19.

I am only able to give these two illustrations of Dr. Van der Linde's failure in bibliography, as, in his whole book, he has made no more than these two attempts at bibliographical descriptions. Everyone will probably come to the conclusion that this abstinence on his part is rather fortunate.

I am not the only person who finds fault with Dr. Van der Linde's work. Mr. W. H. James Weale, in his *Descriptive Catalogue of Rare and Printed Books*, speaking (on p. 30) of Dr. Van der Linde's *Essay*

* Dr. Arthur Wyss, Archivist of Darmstadt, has raised an important question with regard to this *Vocabularius Ex quo* in Hartwig's *Centralblatt für Bibliothekswissenschaft* (1887), p. 412, just in time for its being mentioned here. In commenting, independently of my own remarks, on Dr. Van der Linde's error in printing "xxix" in the colophon, he observes that, as the printer distinctly points out that the day of Thomas the Apostle (21 December) was a *Saturday* (*Sabbato die*) and in the year 1477 that day was a *Sunday*, 1477 in the colophon must be a mistake for 1476, in which year the day of Thomas the Apostle actually fell on a Saturday. Such an explanation, Dr. Wyss reasonably concludes, would throw light on two other circumstances to which I called attention in my work *Gutenberg, Was he the inventor of printing?* but which I was unable to solve at the time. Namely (1) the types of the Eltville *Vocabularius Ex quo* of 21 Dec., 1477 are the same as those with which Peter Drach at Spire completed a *Vocabularius juris utriusque* on 18 May, 1477. If these two dates were both correct some transfer of types from Peter Drach of Spire to Nicolaus Bechtermünze of Eltville or *vice versa* would have to be presumed; or the two printers might have received some supply from a common typefounder; or Drach might have printed the *Vocabularius Ex quo* for Bechtermünze. (2) Bodmann, in his *Rheinische Alterth.* p. 136, note 5, says that Nicolaus Bechtermünze having died in 1476 without male heirs, his goods were inherited by his brother's children "according to a document of 1476." As nothing of this document was known, and Bechtermünze could not have printed a book in 1477 if he had died in 1476, and Bodmann was known to have forged several documents in behalf of the Gutenberg story—it seemed to me that we had here another Bodmann-forgery (see my *Gutenberg*, pp. 123, 149). It appeared, indeed, strange to me that the word *Sabbatum* should mean here *Sunday*; but the colophon was plain and explicit: the day of Thomas the Apostle (21 December) fell on a "Sunday" in 1477; and as all writers on Chronology pointed out that *Sabbatum* "usually" means "Saturday," I came to the conclusion that here we had the "unusual" but not unknown meaning "Sabbath day" (Sunday) and that there was no mistake in the colophon. Dr. Wyss, however, now suggests: (1) the Eltville *Vocabularius Ex quo* was finished on Saturday, 21 December, 1476 (1477 being a printer's mistake); (2) its printer, Nicolaus Bechtermünze must have died a few days afterwards and his goods divided between his brother's children; (3) Bodmann must have been truthful in this instance, and the document of 1476 probably perished or is still hidden somewhere; (4) Bechtermünze's types passed into the hands of Peter Drach of Spire.

on the *Mentz Psalter of 1457*, which he published at Wiesbaden in 1884, says that it is

“ Apparently written from notes, and not revised in presence of the *Psalter*, and abounds with mistakes. Moreover, he has . . . entirely failed to recognise the true character of Fust and Schöffer's work. He calls this *Psalter* the *editio princeps* of the Mentz Breviary [whereas it is only one of the four parts of the Breviary].”

Mr. Weale goes on to show how Dr. Van der Linde has misunderstood the whole nature of the *Psalter*, and has deduced the most erroneous inferences from it. In short Dr. Van der Linde appears to have misunderstood the *Psalter* as completely as the Coster and Gutenberg questions.

Here, then, we have a not overdrawn picture of the *linguistic*, *exegetical*, and *bibliographical* failures of an author who imagines, and loudly proclaims, to have settled once for all an intricate international dispute, for the understanding of which a sound linguistic and bibliographical knowledge is indispensable. The way in which Dr. Van der Linde looks upon his connexion with the controversy regarding the invention of printing is best shown by the place which his own portrait occupies in his new book, just opposite the chapter where he records the downfall of Coster, thereby indicating, I suppose, that on the ruins of Lourens Janszoon Coster he fondly imagines to have built up his own fame. We cannot doubt but that the Germans, who are perfectly able to distinguish between science and self-laudation, will soon come to realise the nature of Dr. Van der Linde's work.

CHAPTER III.

DR. VAN DER LINDE MAKES “RESEARCHES.”

In the two previous chapters I have endeavoured to explain that Dr. Van der Linde's compilations on the History of Printing are wholly untrustworthy from an *exegetical* as well as from a *bibliographical* point of view. I now consider it my duty to show that the so-called *researches*, which he professes to have made in the Haarlem Coster-question, can no more be relied upon than all his other work, and that they are in consequence altogether inadequate for scientific purposes.

Until 1816 it had occurred to no one, it seems, to make researches in the Haarlem archives. Junius and all others only related what they had heard. But in that year a certain Jacobus Koning published a book, in which he professed to have carefully collected from the Haarlem registers, account-books, &c., all the entries that could throw light on the subject, and also all documentary evidence that could be found at Haarlem and elsewhere. It does not require much practice in the reading of MSS. to realise that Koning was not the man for such work ; but for a good many years his book was looked upon as beyond reproach and his investigations as quite sufficient. Consequently, all books on the invention of printing published after 1816, were, on

the whole, based on Koning's work, who made his inventor live from about 1370 till about 1439. In 1823, the date of the invention was finally decided by the Haarlem people to have been 1423; and, when an entry in a Haarlem account-book was found, from which it appeared that a certain "Laurens Janszoon" had actually died in 1439, everything seemed settled. After some time, however, fresh researches brought out the fact that there had lived at Haarlem a "Laurens Janszoon Coster," whose name agreed better with the account of Junius. But this man had lived much longer than 1439, even later than 1483, and could, therefore, not possibly be the same man as the "Laurens Janszoon" who had been traced back in history to the end of the fourteenth century, and who had been regarded as the inventor. So that the whole history of the Haarlem invention was thrown into confusion. We then see Dr. Van der Linde appear, making researches in archives, churches, &c. He found it no difficult task to persuade people that Koning's work was valueless; and, as he mercilessly abused Koning and all other authors who had believed in a Haarlem invention, it was concluded that what Dr. Van der Linde produced as his own researches was sound and correct. We find him demonstrating the worthlessness of Koning's work at great length in the *Haarlem Legend* (1870), in the *Gutenberg* (1878), and, once again, in his new book.

Last December, when I was invited to write the article "Typography" for the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, I felt bound to ascertain whether my doubts as regards Dr. Van der Linde's own work were justified; and I went to Haarlem to verify his extracts from the original MS. registers preserved in the archives there. It seemed to me best to begin with his extracts relating to the life of Lourens Janszoon, which he commences to print at great length on p. 342. As his first two entries were taken from MSS. at the Hague, I had to begin at Haarlem with his *third* entry on p. 344, under the year 1418, which records (according to him) that several men were sent from Haarlem on a mission to Gouda. Among these men we find the name of Laurens Janssoen printed in very distinct type in Dr. Van der Linde's book. But when I looked into the original register, I found *not* "Laurens Janssoen," but plainly *lottiin* (*i.e.*, Lottijn) Janssoen, therefore quite a *different man*. I referred to Koning's work (p. 66), published, as I have said, in 1816. Yes, he, too, had "*Lauriis* Janssoen." I noticed at the same time that both Koning and Dr. Van der Linde printed in the same entry Walter *Huysen*, whereas the MS. has clearly Walter *Buysen*. Therefore, at the very first touch, the nature of Dr. Van der Linde's "researches" are revealed to us. The original MSS. had evidently been too difficult for him, and so he simply reproduces the "researches" of 1816.

But I have to relate worse things. A few days afterwards, I saw at the Hague Koning's MS. note-book, in which he had made most elaborate extracts from the Haarlem registers for his work published in 1816. This MS. note-book had come into the possession of Dr. Van der Linde, who, after the completion of his *Haarlem Legend*, presented it to the Royal Library at the Hague. In this note-book, Dr. Van der Linde has written NB. (*nota bene*) by the side of every entry that related to L. Janssoen; but, strange to say, no such NB. is found by the side of the entry of 1418. This entry Koning himself wrote as "(lackiin) janssoen," which makes it clear that he had seen, at the

moment that he copied it, that the name in the register was not *Lauriis*. But somehow or other he seems to have got over his difficulty, and printed *Lauriis*. We can forgive Koning, who blundered in this way in 1816. But what are we to think of Dr. Van der Linde, who never neglects to abuse Koning in the most unrelenting manner, calling him a "literary rascal" and other names which I need not repeat here; and yet, in his own incapacity of dealing with MSS., is driven to reprint, *verbatim*, the poor blunders of his poor victim, and to dish them up to us as the fruits of his own "research"?

Does not this instance alone condemn the whole of Dr. Van der Linde's *Haarlem Legend*? But I must give a still more glaring example of his pitiful dependence upon others in his "researches."

We know that it is said that Louwerys Janssoen, the man who some regarded as the inventor of printing, died in 1439, according to an entry in the burial-register of that year in the Cathedral Church at Haarlem. In 1870, in his *Haarlem Legend* (p. 197, Dutch edition, p. 119, English translation), Dr. Van der Linde records this entry as follows: "Item *lou Janss. breet ii. gra. cloc en graf*"; and he adds distinctly that a former reading (*gul* instead of *gra*), published in 1824, falls to the ground as there is question of 2 *graves*, not of two *guilders*. In 1878, in his *Gutenberg* (p. 394), the same Dr. Van der Linde records the same entry in a German dress as follows: "Item *lou janss. breet 2 gulden* (der archivär Enschedé liest *gräber*) *glocke und grab 1439.*" And at the end of 1886, when he assures us that he has *mastered* at last the whole subject, the very same Dr. Van der Linde records the very same entry as follows (p. 354): "Item *lou janss. breet ii grā. cloc en graf.*" And for the benefit of the German reader he adds a German translation of the entry: that is to say, "Item *Laurens Janszoon, broad two graves, for the sounding of the clock [i.e., bell] and burial.*" He then goes on to fill nearly six of his quarto pages with quotations on this entry.

Now, long before I had an opportunity of making researches at Haarlem, I wondered whether Dr. Van der Linde had ever tried to *master* the entry, or to account for the fact that there was question (as he, or his informant, says) of *two graves*. Surely the *lou Janssoen*, to whom the entry refers, could not possibly have been such a giant as to require *two graves*? But as I had already realised that Dr. Van der Linde never cares about, or thinks of, what he prints, I thought it better to ask no questions, and to wait till I could see the MS. myself. On Friday, January 7, 1887, I saw it, and read (on folio 20b):

	Abrect ii gul
Item lou ianssn	Acloc ende graf

The whole line: "Item . . . graf" is written by the same hand that wrote the greatest part of the register, but a different, though certainly contemporary, hand added the Λ , as a mark of reference, by the left side of the word *cloc*, and also " Λ brect ii gul" above the line.

There can be no hesitation about the reading of the entry as given above by me, and the meaning becomes clear when we examine the register a little further. The receipts for the soundings of the bell and for the graves commence on fol. 18a. At first the costs of bell and grave are recorded at each entry, always fifteen scilds for bell and grave together; one scild for a child; five scilds for the bell alone. But the writer,

seeing that nearly all the entries would have to be the same, began to omit the amounts of the money on fol. 20a and 20b; and so we find on p. 20b, which concerns us, fourteen names of buried persons with the addition of "cloc ende graf," but without the payments; further, four names with "cloc" alone, and one name with neither "cloc" nor "graf." Among the fourteen names with "cloc ende graf" is that of our Lou Janssn. There can be no doubt that the expenses for his bell and grave were, as on the previous pages, fifteen scilds. But somehow or other the relatives of the buried man seem to have been short of money, and did not pay the whole of the fifteen scilds. Consequently, another hand added above the line, but with a distinct mark of reference Λ , to this entry, that *two* guilders had been left unpaid: "brect [not *breet*] ii gul." The word *brect* (partic. of *breken*), in the sense of *wanting*, *short of*, is neither unknown nor uncommon (see Verwys and Verdam, *Middel-nederl. Woordenboek*, col. 1434). It occurs in the same sense, four times over, on leaf 37b of the same register, written by the same hand.

No one need be surprised that Dr. Van der Linde never *mastered* this simple entry. That he published it three times over (in 1870, in 1878, and in 1886), each time in a *different* way, and each time with comments and notes, and yet never saw the palpable absurdity of his readings, is quite in harmony with all that we see of his work. Nor must we be surprised that he never took the trouble to examine the original entry himself, though he is a native of Haarlem, resided there for some time, and could have had easy access to the register; for he prefers to copy from others, knowing full well that the deciphering of MSS. is not his strong point. But we may well ask, was there no Dutch archivist, or librarian, or ordinary scholar, all the time from 1823, when the entry was first discovered and misread, till 1886, when it was published again, perhaps, for the twentieth time, to discover the absurdity of the various readings? This entry certainly shows what is still possible in the nineteenth century.

If anyone asks whether the detection of these erroneous readings alters, materially, the biography of the Haarlem inventor, as it has been presented to us by Dr. Van der Linde, I must answer *No*. The genealogy of the two men (Laurens Janszoon and Laurens Janszoon Coster), whom Dr. Van der Linde declares to have been mixed up by all later authors on the Haarlem claims, still calls for further investigation, though there is nothing particularly obscure about it. But I soon saw that even a cursory reading and copying of the manuscript registers at Haarlem by myself was out of the question, as such a work would have required several months, if not years, and I had only a few days at my disposal. But I believe that what I found at the first touch of Dr. Van der Linde's work shows conclusively that he has either made no "researches" at all, or has made them without being properly trained for the work; and, under these circumstances, we cannot, I think, but dismiss the case which he has presented to us. When persons are unable to decipher MSS., and yet compile genealogies from MSS., the chances are not only that they take hold of the wrong persons, as we see Koning and his copyist, Dr. Van der Linde, do, but the true persons may escape them. I believe it will be clear to everybody, from what I have said above, that science must require something more trustworthy than Dr. Van der Linde's unreliable compilations from equally unreliable authors before it can decide that the tradition of the invention

of printing at Haarlem is a myth. I hope presently to show that I, in common with a good many others, still believe in that tradition, and I will state my reasons for that belief. Should these reasons be found acceptable, it will be the duty of those who take an interest in the matter to see that proper researches are made with respect to the inventor. Who is to make them? It is clearly the duty of the Dutch to make an effort to place this matter upon a more satisfactory footing. They have, hitherto, conducted the controversy in a manner which does not do them any great credit. And it seems almost incredible that the wrong readings which I have pointed out above could have been before their eyes for many years without being noticed, especially as the reading of the burial-entry, as given by Dr. Van der Linde, is such a palpable absurdity. Persons like myself, living far away from the documents, can only make spasmodic efforts; and researches at Haarlem are not so very easy, nor do they seem to be greatly favoured by the Haarlem authorities; at least, that was my impression last January. When MSS. and documents which require careful and anxious examination have to be examined while their official custodian sits at your elbow, and considers it his duty to hand you every document and take it from you whenever you think it necessary to lay it aside for a moment in order to look at another, a serious and thorough examination is out of the question. Yet this was the condition under which I had to conduct my inquiries at Haarlem. It made me remember with what comfort and ease one can do a long day's work in the British Museum without ever having to struggle with a fussy interference on the part of authorities who yet manage to guard their treasures carefully. Let us hope that what I have said above will awaken the Dutch to a sense of their duty, and induce them to publish forthwith all that can in any way lead to the clearing up of a subject which has already waited too long for a scientific treatment, and the confusion of which is manifestly used by Dr. Van der Linde to serve his own personal ends.

CHAPTER IV.

MANUSCRIPTS, BLOCKBOOKS, AND THE FIRST APPEARANCE OF PRINTING.

I BELIEVE I have shown conclusively that Dr. Van der Linde's books on the invention of printing are wholly unreliable; and I think that, for this reason alone, we are bound to reject his contention of having demolished the tradition of a Haarlem invention by Lourens Janszoon Coster, even if nothing could be said to support that tradition. I will now endeavour to demonstrate (1) that, before we can accept Gutenberg as the inventor of printing, we must first shut our eyes to a good many things which, in my opinion, clearly show that the *Cologne Chronicle* of 1499 was not wrong in saying that the *first prefiguration*, the *beginning* of the art of printing was taken from the *Donatuses*, printed in Holland before there was any printing at Mentz; and (2) that Hadrianus Junius cannot yet be convicted of being wrong in ascribing the honour of the invention of printing with movable types to L. J. Coster, of Haarlem.

I will ask the reader to take first a cursory glance at the literary development of the two centuries immediately preceding the invention of printing with movable metal types.

Before that invention, and before the practice of wood-block printing (xylography), therefore, as late as the second half of the fourteenth century, every book, including school and prayer books; every public and private document, proclamation, bull, letter, &c., was written by hand. All figures and pictures, even playing cards and images of saints were drawn with the pen, or painted with a brush. Sufficient evidence has come to light to enable us to say that in the thirteenth century there existed already a kind of book trade. The organisation of universities and of large ecclesiastical establishments was at that time incomplete, especially in Italy, France, and Germany, without a staff of scribes and transcribers (*scriptores*), illuminators, lenders, sellers, and custodians of books (*stationarii librorum, librarii*), and *pergamenerarii*, i.e., persons who prepared and sold the vellum or parchment required for books and documents.

The books supplied at that time were for the most part of a legal, theological, and educational nature, and are calculated to have amounted to about one hundred different works. No book or document was approved without some ornamented and illuminated initials or capital letters, and hence there was no want of illuminators at that time. The workmen-scribes and transcribers were, perhaps without an exception, calligraphers, and the illuminators for the most part artists. Beautifully written, and richly illuminated, MSS. on vellum became objects of luxury, which were eagerly bought and treasured up by princes and people of distinction. Burgundy in the fifteenth century (with its rich literature, wealthy towns, love for art, and the Flemish school of painting) was, in this respect, the centre and lustre of Europe; and the libraries of its dukes at Brussels, Bruges, Antwerp, Ghent, &c., contained more than three thousand illuminated MSS.

In speaking of the *writing* of the various MSS. of the fifteenth and two previous centuries, it is essential that we should distinguish between, at least, *four* different classes of writing, two of which must be again sub-divided each into two classes; and as nearly all the different kinds of writing were afterwards taken as models for the types used in the printing of books and documents, a knowledge and classification of writings will make us more readily understand the first history of printing.

We find, then, (1) the *book-hand*, i.e., the ordinary writing of legal, theological, and devotional books (commentaries on the laws, and on Holy Scripture, lives of saints, legends, &c.), intended for the use of lectures at the universities, for private instruction or devotion, and the supply of libraries. A good many of such books were written by men whom we may call the official transcribers of the universities and churches. They had received a more or less learned education, and consequently wrote, or transcribed books with a certain pretence of understanding them, and of being able to write with greater rapidity than the ordinary calligrapher. Hence their writing may be called (*a*) the *current* or cursive book-hand, of which a good many illustrations may be found in Wilh. Schum (*Exempla Codicum Amplon. Eifurtensium*). Quite distinct from this *current* writing, and much clearer and more distinct, is (*b*) the *upright* or *set book-hand*, employed by writers of whom

some also worked for universities and churches, while others may be presumed to have worked in large cities and commercial towns for the people in general, and to have been exempt from the privileges, but at the same time from the rules, of the universities.

This book-hand produced, among other books, the lower educational books: as the *Abecedaria*; the *Donatus*, a short Latin grammar extracted from the work of Aelius Donatus, a Roman grammarian of the fourth century; the *Doctrinale*, a Latin grammar in Leonine verses, compiled by Alexander Gallus (or De Villa Dei), a minorite of Brittany of the thirteenth century; the *Summula logica* of Petrus Hispanus (= Pope John XXI., elected in 1276), used in the teaching of logic and dialectics; Dionysius Cato's *Disticha de moribus*, and its supplement called *Facetus*, with the *Floretus S. Bernardi* used in the teaching of morals. So we find the Company of Stationers (*stationarii*) existing in London as early as 1403, and supplying transcripts of various books, also ABC books, paternosters, credos, &c. From the labours of this Company arose the names Paternoster Row, Creed Lane, Amen Corner, Ave Maria Lane, while the association of typographers and booksellers in London is still called the Stationers' Company.

(2) The *church-hand*, which produced transcripts of the Bible, missals, psalters, and other works intended for the use in churches and private places of worship. This writing we may again sub-divide into two classes: (a) the *ornamented* or *caligraphic* writing, found exclusively in books (Bibles, missals, psalters, breviaries, &c.) intended for the use in churches, or for the private use of wealthy and distinguished persons; (b) the ordinary *upright* or *set church-hand*, used for less ornamental or less expensive books, and, in some cases, identical or very similar to the set book-hand. (3) The *letter-hand*, which may be said to intervene between the set literary book-hand (1, b) and the set literary church-hand (2, b). It was employed in all public documents of the nature of a letter. (4) The *court* or *charter-hand* used for charters, title-deeds, papal bulls, &c.

What I have said here in general about these classes of writings applies, of course, to each country of Europe in particular; and though each had its own national character, yet the different handwritings of each country may all be arranged with more or less certainty, under some such classes as I have mentioned above. For instance: in Holland the book-hand was chiefly *Gothic*, or, as it is called in this country, black-letter; in Germany bastard-Italian; in Italy the ordinary Caroline Minuscule, and the same somewhat more rounded prevailed.

At the time that writing, transcribing, illuminating, &c., were in their period of greatest development, the *art of printing from wooden blocks* (block-printing, *xylography*) made its appearance in Europe, or, more strictly speaking, in Germany and the Netherlands. It is considered to have been derived from the Chinese, and seems to have been practised as early as the second half of the *fourteenth* century. It certainly was busily employed between 1400 and 1450, and even so late as 1475, in the production (1) of separate leaves (called *briefs*, from *breve*, scripture), containing either a picture (*print*, *prent*), or a piece of text, or both together; (2) whole books, usually called *block-books*, sometimes half picture and half text, or consisting wholly of text or wholly of picture.

Of single sheets (*briefs*) of German origin we have about thirty, of Netherlandish origin about half-a-dozen, preserved in various libraries of the Continent, and some in the British Museum. Of bloek-books of German origin we know about eighteen different works (of some of which several editions are known to exist), *ex. gr.* the *Apocalypse*, or History of St. John the Evangelist (of which six or seven editions are said to exist), the *Ars memorandi*; the *Enndchrist* (the Antiehrst); the *Ars moriendi*; *Biblia Pauperum*, with dates 1470, 1471, 1475 (not to be confused with the editions of the *Biblia Pauperum* of Netherlandish origin); the *Dotendantz*, &c. Bloek-books of Netherlandish origin are the *Biblia Pauperum*; *Ars moriendi*; *Canticum Canticorum*; *Pomerium Spirituale*; *Alphabet* in figures, &c.

The manner in which these leaves and books were printed seems to admit of easy explanation. The block, says Mr. W. M. Conway (in his *Woodcutters of the Netherlands*, p. 2), after the picture or the text had been engraved upon it, was first thoroughly wetted with a thin watery ink, then a sheet of damp paper was laid upon it, and the back of the paper was carefully rubbed with some kind of dabber or burnisher, till an impression from the ridges of the carved bloek had been transferred to the paper. In this fashion a sheet could only be printed on one side (anopisthographic), and the only bloek-book which does not possess this characteristic is the *Legend of S. Servatius*, in the royal library of Brussels.* Therefore, if a man wanted to set up as a printer of *briefs* or *books*, he had simply to buy a set of wood-blocks and a rubber, and his apparatus was complete. It seems probable that wealthy persons and religious institutions were wont to possess such sets of blocks; and when occasion arose, they printed a set of sheets for presentation to a friend, or, in the case of convents, for sale to the passing pilgrim. A printer of briefs or bloek-books had no need to serve an apprenticeship: any neat-handed man could print for himself. So we find that the sister of Jean de Hinsberg (Bishop of Liège, 1419–1455), a nun in the convent of Bethany, near Meehlin, from 1455 till the day of her death, 3 March, 1465, possessed “unum instrumentum ad imprimendas scripturas et ymagines,” and “novem printe liquee ad imprimendas ymagines eum quatuordecim aliis lapideis printis.” As she retired into the convent in the same year that her brother died, it may be presumed that she had inherited these wooden and stone blocks from her brother the Bishop, in which case a much earlier existence of these instruments may be presumed.† Though there is evidence that there existed in those days of briefs and bloek-books a class of workmen or traders called brief-malers (*Priffmaler*) and printers or prenters (evidently, as Prof. Skeat says, from *print*, *prent* shortened from the French *emprint*, *empreinte*, and already used by Chaucer, *C. T.* 6186, six-text, D. 604, *printe*, *prente*, *preente*, and in other early English documents); yet the above two entries, found in the inventory of the possessions of the Bishop and his sister, seem to indicate that people purchased engraved blocks (of wood or of stone) from the woodcutter (*Formschneider*) rather than books from a printer; while

* Passavant, *Le Peintre-Graveur* (i. 57) mentions other block-books printed on both sides.

† See E. Van Even, *L'ancienne école de Peinture de Louvain* (Brussels, 1870, 8°) pag. 104. The author remarks that these instruments prove not only the existence of wood-block printing, but also stone-block printing.

the easy and unceremonious way in which briefs and block-books could be produced, goes far to explain why they are in every way inferior in workmanship, colours, &c., to the MSS. of the same period.

While xylography and the art of writing were at their greatest height of development, *the art of printing with movable metal types* made its appearance. When we leave for the moment out of sight the controversy as to when, where, and by whom the latter art was invented, and only take notice of the well-authenticated dates which appear in the incunabula which have been preserved to us, we see the first *printed* date, 1454, make its appearance twice over in two different editions of one and the same Letters of Indulgence issued by Pope Nicolas V., in behalf of the Kingdom of Cyprus. These two editions are usually called the thirty-one-line and the thirty-line Indulgence. The dates on which the copies that have been preserved to us were sold, run from November 15, 1454, to April 30, 1455. And as in recent years four *written* copies of the same Indulgence have been discovered, which, respectively, bear the dates : Frankfurt, April 10, 1454 ; Frankfurt, April 11, 1454 ; July 11, 1454 (place not known) ; Lübeck, October 6, 1454—we may almost fix the exact time when printing with movable metal types made its appearance in Germany. But the moment that it appears there it is already in a perfect condition, and practised at the same time in *two* different printing offices, apparently established at Mentz, the one perhaps belonging to Johan Gutenberg, the other, without doubt, to Peter Schoeffer of Gernsheim. The next date, 1455, is established (*a*) by the same Letters of Indulgence, the year 1454 being merely altered into 1455 ; (*b*) by a “Manung widder die Durke” or almanack for 1455, therefore, probably, printed at the end of 1454. The next date—August 15, 1456—is established by a MS. note of the binder of a paper-copy of the forty-two-line (or Mazarine) Bible, printed by Peter Schoeffer, preserved in the Paris Library. Then follows the Kalendar for the year 1457, most probably printed at the end of 1456. Then again the printed dates, August 14, 1457 and 1459, with place (Mentz) in the colophons of the Psalter issued by Fust and Schoeffer ; the printed year 1460 (with Mentz added) in the Catholicon, &c., &c. So that, with the exception of 1458, there is no interruption in Mentz printing from the moment that we see it begin there. As regards the printed psalter, its printers are mentioned distinctly in the book itself ; but the other books just mentioned are *assumed* to have been issued by the same two Mentz printing-offices, which are supposed to be already at work there in 1454, though the 1460 Catholicon and some of the other works are ascribed by some to other printers. By the side of these dates, we find already a Bible completed in 1460 by Mentelin at *Strassburg*, according to a MS. note in the copy preserved at Freiburg. And in 1461 Pfister completed at *Bamberg* the printing of Boner’s *Edelstein*, while the same date 1461 is written on the last leaf of a copy (in the Paris Library) of the thirty-six-line Bible, which is ascribed by some to the same Pfister, by others to Gutenberg.

Assuming then, for a moment, that Mentz is the starting-point, we see printing spread to Strassburg in 1460 ; to Bamberg in 1461 ; to Subiaco in 1465 ; in 1466 (perhaps already in 1463) it is established at Cologne ; in 1467 at Eltville, Rome ; in 1468 at Augsburg, Basle, Marienthal ; in 1469 at Venice ; 1470 at Nuremberg, Verona, Foligno, Trevi, Savigliano, Paris ; 1471 at Spire, Bologna, Ferrara, Florence, Milan, Naples, Pavia, Treviso ; 1472 at Esslingen, Cremona, Mantua,

Padua, Parma, Monreale, Fivizzano, Verona ; 1473 at Laugingen, Ulm (perhaps here earlier), Merseburg, Alost, Utrecht, Lyons, Brescia, Messina ; 1474 at Louvain, Genoa, Como, Savona, Turin, Vicenza ; 1475 at Lubeck, Breslau, Blaubeuren, Burgdorf, Modena, Reggio, Cagli, Caselle or Casale, Saragossa ; 1476 at Rostock, Bruges (here earlier?), Brussels ; 1477 at Reichenstein, Deventer, Gouda, Delft, Westminster ; 1478 at Oxford, St. Maartensdyk, Colle, Schussenried, Eichstadt ; 1479 at Erfurt, Würzburg, Nymegen, Zwolle, Poitiers ; 1480 at London, Oudenaarde, Hasselt, Reggio ; 1481 at Passau, Leipzig, Magdeburg, Treves, Urach ; 1482 at Reutlingen, Memmingen, Metz, Antwerp ; 1483 at Leiden, Kuilenburg, Ghent, Haarlem ; 1484 at Bois-le-Duc, Siena ; 1485 at Heidelberg, Regensburg ; 1486 at Munster, Stuttgart ; 1487 at Ingolstadt ; 1488 at Stendal ; 1489 at Hagenau, &c.

CHAPTER V.

THE EARLIEST PRINTERS ALWAYS MANUFACTURED THEIR OWN TYPE.

MOST authors on the invention and spread of printing assert, with more or less emphasis, that there is, so to speak, a continuity of type, or model of type, from 1454 down to—yes, perhaps, down to our own period.

Speculations are always hazarded as to where the first printers of Strassburg, Bamberg, Subiaco, Cologne, Augsburg, Basle, Venice, Paris, Alost, Utrecht, Louvain, Bruges, Westminster, Oxford, &c., learnt the art of printing, or, rather, the art of casting type. Some assume that Johan Gutenberg and Peter Schoeffer either supplied their pupils, on the latter setting up a business of their own, with a quantity of the types which they themselves employed, or transferred to them their own cast-off types ; or the pupils themselves cut and cast their own types, but always, more or less, imitating the types which they had seen employed in their master's printing-office. Some even assume that the great difference observable between the types with which Gutenberg and Schoeffer are said to have started printing, and those which, for instance, Caxton used at Westminster, or Veldenaer at Utrecht, only arose from the Gutenberg and Schoeffer types having been successively imitated (closely, it is true, but always with a shade of difference) by the printers who wandered away from their masters, and cast a type of their own. Already in 1884, when writing on Palaeography in the *Academy* of October 11, I took the opportunity of calling attention to these erroneous views, in quoting a well-known author on writing who said that

“The first printers, being Germans, they naturally imitated the black-letter of the monkish missals then locally in fashion. . . . When the art of printing was carried south of the Alps by the German monks of Subiaco, *they took with them their black-letter types*, but soon found it desirable to conform to the requirements of the Italian book-market by an imitation of the finer forms of the elder minuscule which had come into fashion among the Italian

scribes. The *Lactantius*, printed at Subiaco in 1465, for which the types were cut by Sweinheim, is the first book in which an approach to the rounded Roman forms is seen. Two years later, in 1467, Sweinheim printed at Rome, with greatly improved types, the epistles of Cicero. In 1470 these Roman types, as they were called from the place where they were first adopted, were brought to Paris, and used at the Sorbonne for the first book printed in France."

This is exactly the contrary of what we do find.

When we examine the first printed book or documents of the different places enumerated above, whether of Mentz or of Strassburg, Subiaco, Cologne, Rome, Augsburg, Basle, Venice, Paris, Spire, Alost, Utrecht, Saragossa, Westminster, Oxford, London, &c., till the moment (say, 1480) that printing has spread to almost all the chief towns of Germany, Italy, Switzerland, France, the Netherlands, Spain, England, we see that not a single printer carried away with him, as it is erroneously asserted, a set of types or a set of punches or moulds, from his master; but we find every printer adopt the same measure in establishing his printing-office, namely, he cast a set of types as closely as possible after the model of a particular MS. which he or his patron desired to publish. With the types with which a printer starts he prints a second, a third, a fourth work, or more; or, as we see in some cases, he discards his first type after having employed it in the printing of one book or a single document. But there is never any doubt as to the first step which a printer took in procuring his first or his new set of type. It is simply imitating the handwriting of some MS. provided for him in the place where he settles.

So when we compare the thirty-line Indulgence *printed* by Schoeffer in 1454, with the MS. copy of the same Indulgence dated April 10, 1454, which has recently come to light, we perceive at once that the *types* used in *printing* that document were specially cast for the purpose after the model of the handwriting employed for the *written* copies, and which is clearly the letter-hand of which I have spoken above. We know that the types of the thirty-six line and forty-two line Bibles, and those of the Psalter of 1457, are the closest imitations of the church handwriting customary at the time of their production. And as the text, or brief-type, of the thirty-one line Indulgence closely resembles that of the thirty-line Indulgence, we may be quite sure that the types for that document were also cast in close imitation of some written copy. So, at Subiaco, Sweynheim and Pannarts cut, no doubt, their types after the handwriting of some MS. of Cicero or *Lactantius* preserved in the convent there, regardless of any types that they had seen at Mentz or elsewhere. They abandoned their Subiaco type when they settled at Rome, and cast a new one after the model of some Roman MS. The first Venice printers did the same. And when, in 1470, three German printers established a printing-press at Paris, we find them start, not with types brought from Rome, or elsewhere, but with types cast after the written characters then in vogue at Paris, which was, indeed, if we like to call it so, *Roman* in its character; but it was only *Roman* in this sense, that the latter was what in earlier centuries would have been called the *Caroline Minuscule*, which was also the French writing.

I think it unnecessary to elaborate this point further, as anyone may verify it for himself by comparing any book of the first Paris printers preserved in the Paris library, with the writing found in a good

many of them—*e.g.*, (a) the *Guil. Fichetus Rhetorica* (paper copy), of which work the British Museum also possesses a copy on vellum, having a prefatory letter addressed to Pope Sixtus IV., the first page of which is written; (b) the *Bessarion Epistolae*, and especially (c) the *Cicero Officia* of 1472, in which the headings have been added in a handwriting which hardly differs from the printed text at all.

Mr. William Blades, the well-known author of the *Life of William Caxton*, gave, some years ago, an account of the types of the first printers which substantially agrees with my own. His remarks passed under my eyes in 1870; but their bearing escaped me at the time, and it was only a few days ago, long after I had written the above remarks, that I read them accidentally again. As Mr. Blades has shown himself to be such a careful and accurate observer of types and printers' habits, I consider it useful to quote him here.

“The first printer, when he set about forming his alphabet, was never troubled as to the shape he should give his letters. The form which would naturally present itself to him would be that to which he and the people to whom he hoped to sell his productions, had been accustomed. It is not at all wonderful, therefore, that the types used in the first printed books closely resemble the written characters of the period; nor that this imitation should be extended to all those combinations of letters which were then in use by the scribes. Thus the Psalters and Bibles which appeared in Germany, among the first productions of the press, were printed in the characters used by the scribes for ecclesiastical service-books, while more general literature was printed in the common bastard-roman. When Sweynheim and Pannarts, emigrating from Germany, took up their abode at the famous monastery of Subiaco, near Rome, they cut the punches for their new types in imitation of the Roman letters indigenous to the country, although the Gothic tendency still shows itself. In the dominions of the Duke of Burgundy, where the vocation of the scribes had been so extensively encouraged, we find the same plan pursued. Colard Mansion, the first printer at Bruges, was also a celebrated caligrapher, and the resemblance between his printed books and the best written MSS. of his time, is very marked. The same character of writing was also in use in England; and Caxton's types bear the closest resemblance to the handwriting in the Mercers' books, and to the volumes of that era in the Archives of Guildhall.”

Nothing could be clearer and more to the point. I only wish to make one observation with respect to the “Gothic tendency” in the Subiaco type, of which Mr. Blades speaks, and of which Mr. T. B. Reed speaks also in his excellent work on *Old English Letter Founders* (p. 41). I must say that I do not myself see any “Gothic tendency” in it; but if there be any, it was not imported by Sweynheim and Pannarts from Germany or elsewhere, but was “indigenous” to Italy, as Gothic writing was by no means unknown in that country.

In fact, if any types or models of types had been imported by Sweynheim and Pannarts from Germany into Italy, they would have looked more like Italian than German; for the types used by the first printers of Germany resemble the Italian writing of the time to such an extent that the brief-types of the two Indulgences of 1454 might easily be declared to be imitations of Italian handwritings, if we had no other except Italian handwritings to compare them with. It is only when we place them side by side with undoubtedly German products, such as the block-book called the *Endtchrist* (of which a fac-simile is given in Sotheby's *Principia Typographica*, II., pl. lxiii.),

that we realise that the types of the Indulgences are formed after German writing. So again, the types of the Catholicicon of 1460 (Mentz) look Italian, without any mixture of the German element, as may be seen by comparing them with the writing of the Dante figured on plate 199 of the first series of the London Palæographical Society, a MS. *Doctrinale* preserved in the British Museum (Harl. 2577) and Schum's *Exempla Codd. Amplon., Facs.* 21. But, on the other hand, when we compare the Catholicicon types with MSS., undoubtedly written by Germans,* we see that Italian hardly differed from German writing. So that we cannot be too cautious in such matters, all the more so, as we have very few materials for investigations of this kind.†

CHAPTER VI.

THE HABITS OF THE EARLIEST PRINTERS.

IN the midst of the universal system of printer after printer setting up business, with a new type modelled after some handwriting within his reach, there would be, if the conjectures of a good many bibliographers have any value, only *two* exceptions. The one would be Albrecht Pfister, who began, as it is asserted, his career in 1461 as printer at Bamberg with types transferred to him, it is said, by his master, Johan Gutenberg, after the latter had already printed with them (1) the thirty-six line Bible, (2) the rubrics of the thirty-one line Indulgence of 1454 and 1455, (3) the Manung of (1454) 1455, (4) the *Conjunctiones solis et lunæ*, or Kalendar of (1456) 1457, (5) the undated Cisianus, and two or three or more editions of Donatus. It must be plain that this transfer from Gutenberg to Pfister looks suspicious in regard to the universal law of a separate and independent beginning of every other early printer. There can be no doubt that Pfister printed in 1461 an edition of Boner's *Edelstein* at Bamberg, to all appearances, with the identical types of the thirty-six line Bible; nor can there be any doubt that from 1461 till about 1470 he printed at least eight other works of considerable size with the same types. We also know that a good many bibliographers ascribe or have ascribed the thirty-six line Bible, and the four other works mentioned above, to Albrecht Pfister; and I see certainly no reason why we should not do so, all the more as this would be in perfect harmony with the custom of all the early printers of starting independently, and with other circumstances connected with the history of the thirty-six line Bible. But I hesitate to take these works away from Gutenberg. I have already *robbed* him of the forty-two line

* See, for instance, the handwriting on pl. 6 and 7 in Wilh. Schmidt, *die Inkunabeln d. Kupferstichs im Kon. Cabinet zu München*. (4to., München, 1887.)

† If Dr. Van der Linde had spent the money, furnished him by the Germans for the publication of his book, in providing us with reliable fac-similes of German products of writing, xylography, and printing, he would have done something creditable to himself and his employers. Instead of that, he has squandered German money on a totally unnecessary book, illustrated by a number of foolish plates and portraits which cannot be of the slightest use to anybody.

Bible (see my *Gutenberg*, pp. 166, 171), and of seven other works (see my *Gutenberg*, p. 107, sqq.) which bibliographers, and notably Dr. Van der Linde, had ascribed to him on the strength of a forged inscription and a falsified date. And if we ascribed the thirty-six line Bible and the four other works printed in the same type to Pfister—because a transfer of types from Gutenberg to Pfister is diametrically opposed to all that we see happen in the first twenty-five years of the art of printing—we should, for the same reason, have to rob Gutenberg of all the other works which his worshippers attribute to him. Namely, the types with which (1) the *Catholicon* of 1460; (2) Matth. de Cracovia, *Tractatus rationis*; (3 and 4) *Thomas de Aquino Summa de articulis fidei* (two editions); and (5) an Indulgence of 1461 are printed, are said to be Gutenberg's types; but they are unquestionably in the possession of the two brothers Bechtermünzce at Eltville in 1467. And as a transfer of types from Gutenberg to the Bechtermünzces is as diametrically opposed to all that we see happen in the first twenty-five years of the art of printing, as a transfer of types from Gutenberg to Pfister, it would seem more consonant to reason if we allowed Henry Bechtermünzce to begin his career independently, as the printer of the *Catholicon* at Mentz, in 1460, and afterwards himself transfer his own types to Eltville. This becomes all the more probable as recent researches have made it certain, says Dr. Van der Linde, that Gutenberg did not go to Eltville as has hitherto been supposed, but remained in Mentz, till his death in 1468. But I do not know what to advise. If we took all these books away from Gutenberg, he would no longer have a leg to stand upon, as nothing would be left to us to attribute to him, not even the thirty-one line Indulgence of 1454. Perhaps we had better leave this matter for the present to Dr. Van der Linde. He may probably be able to tell us something about it in his *maximum opus*, which, I suppose, he is preparing by this time. And as he invariably tells us something that is wrong, unless he can copy from others, we shall perhaps know, when he gives us his opinion, how we are *not* to deal with these books.

Another most important feature in the earliest books is that the printers endeavoured to imitate, not only the handwriting, with all its signs of contractions, combined letters, &c., but all the other peculiarities, of their manuscripts. There is, in the first place, the *unevenness* of the lines, which could be avoided neither in MSS. nor in the block-books, but which in the earliest printed books has hitherto, erroneously as I think, been attributed to the inability of the printers to space out their lines. This unevenness is, in my opinion, simply part and parcel of the system of imitating manuscripts. Secondly, blanks were left, as in the MSS., for the *initial* at the beginning of the book, and for all further initials of the chapters into which a work was divided, to be filled up afterwards by the rubricator or illuminator. Where a book or its chapters had one or two lines as title, these were usually not printed in, but added by hand, either because the printing of them in red (as in the MSS.) was not yet understood, or regarded as inconvenient, or because this manipulation gave the book still more the appearance of a close imitation of the manuscript. In fact everything was done to make the books as faithful copies of the original manuscript as could be done by the new mechanical process, which at its rise was merely looked upon as a more speedy mode of producing books than by hand, and the term *typoscript* would be, I think, very appropriate to

the new product. This system of imitating the MSS. was sometimes carried out to a very great extent. In the Paris Library, for instance, there are two copies of the *Liber Epistolarum* of Gasparinus Pergamensis (Paris, 1470), from which we may see how the initial G of the first line, and the initial M of the fourth line had been accidentally printed in; and how in one copy these printed initials have been allowed to remain as they are, but in the other copy were considered to be a mistake, and scratched out and replaced by a rubricated G and M.

This idea of simply imitating and reproducing MSS. is not abandoned till many years after the first printed date (1454) made its appearance; and looking at the books printed, say from 1454 to 1477, from our present standpoint of daily improvement and alteration, the printing of that period may be almost said to have been stagnant. It is true, some printers (as for instance Sweynheym and Pannarts at Subiaco and Rome, and Nic. Jenson at Venice) produced handsomer books than, for instance, Mentelin at Strassburg, Pfister at Bamberg, Zell at Cologne, Martens at Alost, Ketelaer and De Leempt at Utrecht, Caxton at Westminster; but this is to be attributed to the beauty of the MSS. which the former imitated, and the paper which they used, rather than to any superior skill on their part. It is also true that with respect to the initials some novelties become gradually visible; hyphens become more generally used, or more uniform in their shape; signatures are here and there printed together with the text; catchwords are introduced, &c., but all this is again to be ascribed, in the first instance, to the influence and example of the MSS. which the printers had before them, and it is only long afterwards that these peculiarities are worked off as a matter of course. Generally speaking, therefore, we shall not be very far wrong in saying that the workmanship of Ketelaer and De Leempt's first book published at Utrecht (*circa* 1473), and that of Caxton's first book issued at Westminster in 1477, exhibit the very same stage of the art of printing as the Letters of Indulgence of 1454.

So that, if to-morrow we found any evidence that Ketelaer and De Leempt had really printed their first book in 1454, or that Caxton had actually printed his first book in 1450, there would be nothing in the workmanship of the first books of these printers to prevent us from placing them in the years 1454 or 1450, and reversely, if there were no date in the 1454 Indulgences or any of the other early books of Mentz, no one would dream of placing them so early but ascribe them to 1470-1475. I can do no better than refer the reader to fac-similes in Mr. Blades's *Caxton* (pl. ii.) of a Colard Mansion book printed about 1476, and of Caxton's Chess-book (pl. v.), printed before 1477, and one which I have given (in my *Gutenberg*, p. 180) of an Eltville book, printed (*circa* 1472) in the very brief-type (or a very close imitation of it) used in 1454 in the thirty-one line Indulgence. From a comparison of these fac-similes with the Indulgence it must be clear that no progress can be detected from 1454 to 1477. The 1454 Indulgences are printed on one side only; but merely because its nature required it to be so printed, not because the printers of Germany of that date were unable to print on both sides.

CHAPTER VII.

THE "COSTERIANA."

HAVING explained the peculiar, but consistently stationary or unaltered, workmanship of the books printed from 1454 to (say) 1477, and the spread of typography to the chief places of Europe, we may now divert our attention to a group of early printed books which have, until recently, been always ascribed to Laurens Janszoon Coster, the reputed Haarlem inventor of printing, and which, for want of a better and more significant name, I will continue to call Costeriana. In my translation of the "Haarlem Legend," published by Mr. Blades in 1871, I gave a classified list of these books, which I repeat here, with such additions or alterations as have come to my knowledge during the interval.

It is necessary to point out that there is no positive evidence that the eight types, which I mention, have *all* been in the office which published the editions of the *Speculum* (in type i.). Type ii. (used for the printing of two leaves of that work) is inseparably connected with type i.; and, as the former is so much like type iii. that some consider these two types identical, nothing would be gained by separating them. Type iv. and v. occur in one and the same book; and as certain letters of type v. are identical with some of type iii., they may all be linked together. Type vi. is identical with type v., except the P, which is larger and of a different form (see Campbell, *Annales*, No. 631). Types vii. and viii. are linked on to the types i.-vi., on account of the great family-likeness between them; they all having that peculiar perpendicular stroke to the cross-bar of the *t*, and a down stroke or curl attached to the *r*, which is found in no other types of the Netherlands.

I exclude from my list the *Donatus* which Dr. Campbell (in his *Annales de la Typographie Néerlandaise*, under No. 638) wrongly ascribes to the same printer who issued the incunabula mentioned below, as there is not the least family-likeness between the type of that *Donatus* and those of the other Costeriana. It has, moreover, signatures; for which reason alone it must be placed much later, and separated from the Costeriana, in none of which signatures are found.* Nor do I include in my list Dr. Campbell's Nos. 621 and 622 (fragments of *Donatus* of 27 lines, in type v.); nor his Nos. 107, 108, 109 (fragments of the *Doctrinale* of 29 lines, also in type v.), as they are perhaps merely fragments of editions already mentioned in my list.

* I do not wish to refer any reader, who still has to learn something in bibliography, to the list of the Costeriana which Dr. Van der Linde prints on p. 299. of his last work, for it is grossly misleading. But those who are able to peruse buffoonery applied to a serious subject, without any danger to themselves, would do well to glance over his list, which seems to have been drawn up for the sole purpose of mystifying everybody with respect to the Costeriana. Taking advantage of Dr. Campbell's mistake mentioned above, Dr. Van der Linde goes further, and attributes to the printer of the *Speculum* all the books printed in Holland which cannot be ascribed as yet to any definite printer.

CLASSIFIED LIST OF THE COSTERIANA.

[N.B.—Where a book is described in Holtrop's *Catalogus* of the fifteenth century books in the Royal Library at the Hague (Hagae Comitum, 1856, 8vo.), I have given the reference (BRH.), which indicates at the same time that a copy or fragment of the work is preserved in that Library. Where there is a fac-simile or a description of any book in the same writer's *Monumens Typographiques des Pays-Bas* (La Haye, 1868, 4to.), I have referred to the plate or the page (MT.). I have also referred to Ca(= M.F.A.G. Campbell's *Annales de la Typographie Néerlandaise*, La Haye, 1874, 8vo.); Meerman (*Origines typographicae*, 2 vols. 4to. Hagæ Com. 1765); Sotheby (*Principia typographica*, 3 vols. fol. Lond., 1858); Bernard (*De l'Origine et des Débuts de l'Imprimerie en Europe*, 2 vols. 8vo. Paris, 1853); Ennen (*Katalog der Incunabeln in der Stadt-Bibliothek zu Köln*, herausg. von Dr. L. Ennen); Wetter (*Kritische Geschichte der Erfindung der Buchdruckerkunst*, 8vo. Mainz, 1836).]

TYPE I. (also called the *Speculum* type).1. *Speculum Humanæ Salvationis* (mixed Latin edition). Small folio.

Described BRH. 560; MT. p. 22; Bernard I. 13 sqq.—Facs. MT pl. 20, 21; Sotheby I. pl. xxxii.

It consists of thirty-two sheets or sixty-four *unopisthographic* leaves (of which the first is blank), each printed page having on the top a woodcut divided into two compartments, separated by a pillar, with a line in Latin indicating the subject of the engraving, and below a text divided into two columns, corresponding to the two compartments of the engraving on the top.

Collation: a³ bod⁷ e³=32 sheets; the preface (which is in verse and not divided into two columns) occupies the leaves 2 to 5 of quire *a*. Twenty of the leaves are wholly (figures as well as text) printed xylographically (*i.e.*, from wooden blocks), namely (in quire *b*) leaves 6-19, 7-18, 9-16, 10-15, 11-14, 12-13; (in quire *c*) leaves 21-32, 22-31, 26-27; (in quire *e*) leaves 51-60.

Copies: 1. Museum Meerman-Westreenen (the Hague); 2. British Museum (Grenville collection); 3. Bodleian Library, Oxford; 4. and 5. Paris Library (2 copies; one perfect, the other wanting the blank leaf); 6. Mr. Holford; 7. Earl Spencer (Dibdin, vii. 186, No. 309); 8. Pembroke Library at Wilton House; 9. Library at Haarlem; 10. Royal Public Library at Hanover, wanting the leaves 19 and 24, whereas it has the leaves 15 and 28 double (*see* Bodemann, *Incunabeln*, p. 20); 11. Royal Library at Berlin (formerly in the collection of Frid. Jac. Roloff); for other copies *see* Bernard I. 16, note.

N.B.—It is to be noticed that Mr. Campbell, in his *Annales*, says (No. 1570) that the two Paris copies belong to the unmixed Latin edition (*see* 2), and his statement has evidently been copied by Mr. W. M. Conway (*The Woodcutters of the Netherlands*, p. 11) and Dr. Van der Linde (*Geschichte*, p. 307). But it is a mistake, as the two copies undoubtedly belong to the Latin edition, which has twenty pages of woodcut text.

2. The same work (unmixed Latin edition). Small folio.

Described BRH. 561; Sotheby I., 145; Bernard I., 17.—Facs. MT. pl. 17 (19); Sotheby I. pl. xxix. and xxx.

This edition contains the same number of anopisthographic leaves, divided in the same way as in No. 1, but the text of all the pages is printed typographically.

Copies : 1. Museum Meerman-Westreenen, the Hague (wanting preface) ; 2. (John B. Inglis, bought by) Mr. B. Quaritch ; 3. Imperial Library at Vienna (perfect) ; 4. Library in the Palace Pitti at Florence (perfect ; see Bernard, I., 23, note) ; 5. Town Hall at Haarlem (wanting preface) ; 6. Royal Public Library at Hanover (46 leaves only ; see Bodemann, *Incunabeln*, p. 18) ; 7. Royal Library at Brussels (wanting 5 leaves).

[N.B.—In the Meerman-Westreenen copy, leaf 42 (46) offers this peculiarity, that it consists of two slips of paper adjusted together, one containing the woodcut, the other the text. It would seem that after the printing of the engraving and the text, the upper part of the leaf containing the engraving was damaged, and that the printer, in order to remedy the defect, and at the same time to preserve the text, cut away the greatest part of the engraving, leaving only a margin large enough for another impression of the same engraving to be pasted upon it. In copy 4, the circumstances here described are just reversed, the impression of the text having failed, the lower portion of the leaf is replaced by another pasted on the upper part of the leaf. In the copy at Lille (which belongs to the unmixed Dutch edition, see below, No. 4) the pages 8-15 (the fourth sheet of the second quire) and 23-28 (the fifth sheet of the third quire) offer the same peculiarities.]

3. The same work (mixed Dutch edition). Small folio.

Described BRH. 562 ; Bernard, I. 17.—Facs. MT. pl. 18 ; Sotheby pl. xxxi. and xxxiv. 3 ; Ottley, Inquiry, I. 249.

This edition (which is a translation of the work into Dutch prose) consists of 62 anopisthographic leaves, which are divided as in the Latin editions, the first quire, however, having only four leaves (three for the preface and one for the table of contents). The 49th and 60th leaf are printed with a different type (type II., see below, No. 19). These two pages differ, moreover, among themselves in some of the copies (see Meerman, I., 121, note cl.). On page 40, the last line is printed upside down.

Copies : 1. Museum Meerman-Westreenen, the Hague ; 2. Earl Spencer ; 3. Enschedé (having first been bound up with a work printed at Zwolle in 1489 ; it was at the Enschedé sale bought by Mr. Quaritch, and is now in the possession of ?) ; 4. (Marcus, at Amsterdam in 1761, now at) Geneva, in the Public Library.

4. The same work (unmixed Dutch edition). Small folio.

Described BRH. 563 ; Bernard I. 19.—Facs. MT. pl. 22 ; Sotheby I. pl. xxxiii. 1.

This edition contains the same anopisthographic leaves, divided in the same way as No. 3, but they are all printed in one and the same type, which Bernard wrongly describes as differing altogether from that of the other editions.

Copies : 1. Museum Meerman-Westreenen (only leaf 42, which is wanting in the Lille copy) ; 2. Town Hall at Haarlem (see Bernard, I., 23, note) ; 3. Public Library at Haarlem ; 4. Library at Lille, wanting the pages 33 and 46 (the first sheet of the fourth quire), which are replaced by the pages 25 and 26 (the seventh or centre sheet of the third quire), on the versos of which are printed the pages (but not the engravings) 47 and 62 (the first sheet of the fifth quire), which latter are found also in their proper places. These sheets are, therefore, printed on *both* sides (opisthographic), and are, perhaps, proof-sheets of the printer. (See a description of the copy in detail by Bernard, I. 20 sqq.) ; 5. Pembroke Library at Wilton House ; 6. Lord Spencer's Library (Dibdin IV. 551, No. 997).

5. *A Dutch Version of the Seven Penitential Psalms*, 11 lines on a page.
Described MT. pp. 18 and 19.—No fac-simile.
One sheet, on *vellum*, printed on *one* side, but containing 4 pages in 16mo.
It was found in the Royal Library at Brussels, but is now preserved in the Royal Library at the Hague. See Campbell, No. 1459.
6. *Donatus (Aelius) de octo partibus orationis*, of 27 lines. 8vo.
No description; no fac-simile.
Two leaves (pp. 3 and 4, and 13 and 14) and a small fragment of pp. 7 and 8 on *vellum*, preserved in the British Museum (pressmark 12932 c 21), stuck in another edition of the same work printed at Reutlingen, 1495.
[N.B.—There are two leaves of a *Donatus* of 27 lines, printed on *one* side, in the Paris Library; see Van Praet, Velins, Belles Lettres, Vol. IV. No. 11, where he says that they belong “à une édition en caractères mobiles de fonte très-bien gravés; ils ne sont imprimés que d’un seul côté, et paroissent sortir d’une presse des Pays-Bas.”]
[N.B.—There are four other leaves of a *Donatus* of 27 lines in the Paris Library; see Van Praet, Velins, Belles Lettres, Vol. IV. No. 9.]
7. *Donatus*—28 lines. 8vo.
Described BRH. 2; MT. p. 18; Ca. 612.—Facs. MT. pl. 13^a.
One leaf, on *vellum*, which was found pasted in a volume belonging formerly to the Sion Convent at Cologne, containing several treatises printed by Ulr. Zell, among which was: Augustinus de singularitate clericorum, 1467. See Van Praet, Vel. priv. II. 9.
8. *Donatus*—28 lines. 8vo.
Described MT. p. 18; Ca. 613.—Facs. Meerman VI.*
One leaf, on *vellum*, preserved in the Town Hall at Haarlem, and found pasted in the original binding of an account-book of 1474 of the cathedral of the same town, in which an entry occurs from which it appears that the famous “Cornelis the bookbinder,” whom Junius asserts to have been the servant of Laurens Janszoon Coster, had bound that volume. See A. de Vries, *Lyst der Stukken betrekkelyk de Geschiedenis van de Uitvinding der Boekdrukkunst berustende op het Raadhuis te Haarlem* (Haarlem, 1862), p. 7, No. 1.—Two other leaves, preserved in the same Town-Hall, were found in an account-book of the same cathedral, of 1476, also bound by the same Cornelis the bookbinder. See A. de Vries, *Lyst, &c.*, p. 9, No. 2, where the date is wrongly given as 1489. And, finally, several fragments preserved in the same Town-Hall found in account-books (one fragment in a register of 1514) of the same cathedral, all bound by the same Cornelis, the servant of Laurens Janszoon Coster. (See A. de Vries, *Lyst, &c.*, p. 11, Nos. 8 and 9.)
[N.B.—Five leaves (of which the first and third are double) of this *Donatus* are preserved in the Paris Library; see Van Praet, Velins, Belles Lettres, IV., No. 10.]
9. *A Liturgical book* in 16mo, of 12 lines.
Described MT. p. 18.—Facs. MT. 14^{ab}.
Leaves 2 (pp. 3 and 4) and 3 (pp. 5 and 6), printed on *vellum*, discovered by M. Ruelens in the cover of an old book and now preserved in the Royal Library at Brussels. The leaves 1 and 4 are wanting.
10. *Donatus*—30 lines. 8vo.
Described BRH. 5; Ca. 614; MT. p. 19.—Facs. MT. 14^b.
Three leaves, on *vellum*, found in the old binding of a copy of Exhortationes Noviciorum, Deventer (R. Paffroed), 1491, in 4to.
11. *Donatus*—30 lines. 8vo.
Described BRH. 564; Ca. 615.—No Facs.
Fragment, on *vellum*.
12. *Donatus*—30 lines. 8vo.
Described MT. p. 19; Ca. 616 (?).—Facs. Meerman IV.
Two leaves (pp. 19–22), on *vellum*; discovered in 1750 by M.

- Enschedé in a MS. : Handvesten en Privilegien van Kennemerland, 1330-1477. At the sale of his library in 1867, the fragments remained in the possession of the family Enschedé. There are two leaves of the same edition in the Paris Library (*see* Van Praet, *Velins, Belles Lettres*, IV. No. 8).
13. *Donatus* ; a French translation, 29 and 30 lines to a page. 8vo.
No fac-simile.
Four leaves (pp. 1, 2, 3, 4, 9, 10, 11, 12, now in the Utrecht University Library), on *vellum*, found by Dr. Sam. Muller, the archivist of Utrecht, in the binding of a MS. Cartulary of the first half of the 16th century, preserved in the Utrecht Archives.
14. *Alexandri Galli* (or *De Villa Dei*) *Doctrinale puerorum*.—32 lines. 4to.
Described BRH. 558 ; MT. p. 19 ; Ca. No. 102.—Facs. MT. 15^a.
Two leaves, on *vellum*, 4to., containing the verses 191-320.
15. *Alexandri Galli Doctrinale*.—32 lines. 4to.
Described BRH. 557 ; MT. p. 19 ; Ca. No. 101.—Facs. MT. 15^b.
Two leaves, on *vellum*, 4to.
[N.B.—There are 3 leaves of a *Doctrinale* of 32 lines, on *vellum*, preserved in the Royal Library at the Hague (BRH. 3 ; Campbell, 99), which were found in the binding of a "Gemma Vocabulorum," printed by Paffroed at Deventer, 1495. Two leaves, moreover, in the Archives at Cologne (Campbell, No. 100) ; but it is impossible to ascertain to which edition they belong.]
16. *Alexandri Galli Doctrinale*.—32 lines. 4to.
Described BRH. 559 ; MT. p. 20 ; Ca. 103.—Facs. MT. 16^b (27 lines).
Fragment, on *vellum*, in 4to.
17. *Alexandri Galli Doctrinale*.—32 lines. 4to.
Described Campbell *Annales*, No. 98.
Fragment of two leaves, on *vellum*, in the Royal Library at the Hague, and containing the verses 1659-1723, and 1974-2041. It differs from the three preceding editions in the setting up of the text.
18. *Catonis Disticha*.—21 lines.
Described MT. p. 19 ; Dibdin, *Bibl. Spenc.* IV., 474-76.—Facs. *Cat. Spencer* IV. 474 ; Sotheby, I. pl. xxvi. 1 ; MT. 16^a.
Perfect (?) copy of 4 leaves, on *vellum*, in 8vo., in Lord Spencer's Library.

TYPE II.

19. *Speculum Humanae Salvationis*.—Two leaves only (the 49th and 60th) of the mixed Dutch edition (*see* above, No. 3).
Described BRH. 562.—Facs. MT. pl. 19.
Holtrop points out (*Mon. Typ.* p. 21) that the type of these two leaves resembles that of Laur. Valla (type III, *see* *Mon. Typ.* pl. 25). The capitals A and N seem to be *nearly* the same. No trace of this type has hitherto been found in any other book.

TYPE III (also called the *Valla* type).

20. *Laur. Vallae Facetiae morales et Franc. Petrarca de Salibus Virorum illustrium ac facciis Tractatus*.—25 lines. 8vo.
Described BRH. 8 ; MT. pp. 29 and 30.—Facs. MT. pl. 25.
Twenty-four leaves, on *paper*.
Copies : 1. Royal Library at the Hague ; 2. Town Library at Haarlem (Enschedé copy) ; 3. British Museum (Grenville Collection) ; 4. Pfarrer Jaqueré at Mentz.
Holtrop, describing this book in his *Cat. of Fifteenth century books at the Hague*, said that this type was identical with that of the two leaves 49 and 60 of the mixed Dutch *Speculum* (*see* above, No. 19). In his *Monuments* (p. 29), however, he says that it is different, and

this type seems, indeed, a trifle larger. The capitals resemble those of type IV., while one form of the B and the H and M of these two founts are identical.

TYPE IV. (also called the *Pontanus* type).

21. *Donatus*.—24 lines.
Described BRH. 11; Ca. 635; MT. p. 28.—Facs. MT. pl. 13 and 24.
One leaf, and part of another, on *vellum*, 4to.
22. *Donatus*.—24 lines.
Described BRH. 576; Ca. 632; MT. p. 28.—Facs. MT. pl. 13 and 24.
Four leaves, 3, 4, 5, 6, on *vellum*, 4to.
23. *Donatus*.—24 lines.
Described MT. p. 29.—Facs. MT. pl. 13 and 24.
Fragment, on *vellum*, 4to., formerly in the possession of Mr. Fred. Muller, the Amsterdam bookseller, but now in the Town Library at Haarlem.
24. *Donatus*.—24 lines.
Described Van Praet, *Velins*, IV, No. 12; Bernard I, 154 (who is mistaken in saying that it is an edition of 27 lines). Facs. Bernard, I. pl. iv.
Four leaves, on *vellum*, 4to., preserved in the Paris National Library.
[N.B.—There are two leaves and a fragment of a *Donatus* of 24 lines, in this type, in the Cologne Town Library; see Ennen, pp. 7 and 8; and also in the Hague Library; see Campbell, 634.]
25. *Ludovici (Pontani) de Roma Singularia Juris. Pii Secundi Tractatus et Epitaphia*.—26 lines.
Described BRH. 13; MT. p. 26 sqq.—Facs. MT. pl. 23 (recto); Sotheby I. 181, III. 132; Wetter.
Sixty leaves (the first blank) divided into three quires (of 8, 14, 8 sheets), in small folio. The *Tractatus* and *Epitaphia* of Pius II., with 34 lines to a page, commence on leaf 45^b in TYPE V. (see below, No. 39).
Copies: 1. (Enschedé, at Haarlem), Asher and Co. (?); 2. Earl Spencer; 3. Royal Library at the Hague, wanting first (blank) leaf; 4. British Museum, Royal Library (167, h. 13); 5. Royal Library at the Hague (BRH. 13, only 4 leaves); 6. British Museum, only leaf 24 (pressmark: C. 18, e 2, No. 47), the recto of which presents some variations when compared with the other copy.
[N.B.—In No. 1 and 3 the versos of the 55th leaf present some variations (see MT. p. 27).]
26. *Ludovicus (Pontanus) de Roma (?)*, a *Treatise on Canonical Law (?)*.—
Described Campbell, 2nd Suppl., No. 1186^a.
A fragment of one paper leaf, discovered by Dr. P. A. Tiele, the Librarian of the University of Utrecht, in the binding of a volume (pressmark: Theologia, folio, No. 213), which contained two incunabula, printed about 1480. In the volume is found the MS. note: *pertinet regularibus in traiecto*.

TYPE V. (also called the *Saliceto* type).

27. *Guil. de Saliceto de Salute corporis*.
Described MT. p. 32.—No facs.
Two fragments, on *vellum*, which were in 1858 in the possession of M. Cohn (Asher & Co.), Berlin, but are now in the British Museum, pasted (as No. 37) in a volume (lettered on the back *Fragmenta Antiqua*, &c.) with other fragments of early printing. The largest fragment contains the last 21 lines (entire) of leaf 3^b (counting a blank leaf at the beginning) which contain that portion of the work which begins in the other edition (see below No. 40) on leaf 3^b line 18: *circūfere||renciā & excitat in toto corpore . . .*, and ends

with the word *sicut* of 4^a li. 3.—The smaller fragment contains the beginnings, or left side, of the last 21 lines of leaf 5^a, containing that portion of the work which begins in the other edition on leaf 5^a line 4 from foot): *calidis et a nimia* . . . and ends on 5^b line 17: *iobediē f3 sue*.

The fragments were found in the binding of a copy of the *Formulae Noviciorum*, printed at Haarlem, Joh. Andreae, 1486 (which is also in the British Museum). They are printed *anopisthographically*, that is, on *one* side only. Both Mr. Holtrop and Mr. Campbell asserted "that the sides on which at present no printing is found seem to have been scraped to give them the appearance of a blank page." But there is no reason for such a supposition. Nor are the fragments "printer's waste" or "spoiled sheets," for both the fragments have unmistakably been *rubricated*, and are, therefore, the remains of a copy that was duly prepared for use and for sale.

[N.B.—I do not add here the other treatises printed together with the *Saliceto* enumerated below, No. 40, because it is not certain that they were printed with this edition.]

28. *Donatus minor* or *abbreviatus*—26 lines. 4to.
Described BRH. 4; Ca. 630; MT. p. 34.—Facs. MT. pl. 27.
Two sheets (4 leaves, 1, 2, 7, 8?), on *vellum*.
Holtrop, in his *Monuments*, states that the sheet which contains the first page, commencing with the words "*Partes orationis quot sunt*," contains also the last page ending: "*Explicit*." This edition, therefore, was composed of a single quire, and must have been a *Donatus minor*.
29. *Donatus*—27 lines. 4to.
Described BRH. 565; Ca. 617; MT. p. 35.—Facs. MT. pl. 28, 32^b.
Perfect copy (8 + 6), 14 leaves, on *vellum*.
30. *Donatus*—27 lines. 4to.
Described BRH. 6, 566; Ca. 618, 619; MT. p. 35.—Facs. Wetter, XII. 2.
The leaves (3, 6, 9, 14) in the Royal Library at the Hague (BRH. 6) and those (1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 13) in the Museum Meerman-Westreenen (BRH. 566), all on *vellum*, make together one copy of this edition, of which only the leaves 11 and 12 are wanting. There are two more fragments in the Royal Library at the Hague.
31. *Donatus*—27 lines. 4to.
Described BRH. 568; MT. p. 35.—Facs. MT. pl. 28^b.
Leaf 4, on *vellum*.
32. *Donatus*—27 lines. 4to.
Described BRH. 567; Ca. 620; MT. p. 35.—Facs. MT. pl. 29.
Two leaves and part of a third (leaves 2, 7 and 8), on *vellum*.
[N.B. There is another fragment, on *vellum* (BRH. 7), which may belong to another edition of 27 lines.]
33. *Donatus*—27 lines. 4to.
Described BRH. 569; Ca. 628; MT. p. 35.—Facs. MT. pl. 29^b.
Three fragments, namely, the lower parts of leaves 1 and 8, and the upper part of leaf 8, on *vellum*.
[N.B. There are eight leaves (one of which is double) of a *Donatus* of 27 lines in this type in the Paris Library (*see* Van Praet, *Velins, Belles Lettres*, IV. No. 7). There is also a fragment of a leaf, printed on *one* side, in the Cologne Town Library (*see* Ennen, p. 7). At Cologne are, moreover, two leaves (3 and 6) on *vellum* in the archives (Campbell, 621), and two leaves (also 3 and 6) on *vellum* in the Library of the Catholic Gymnasium (Campbell, 622). And several leaves of editions of *Donatus* of 27 lines in this type are in the Bodleian Library; one centre sheet in Brit. Mus., Tab. xi. b. 11.]
34. *Alexandri Galli Doctrinale*—26 lines. 4to.
Described BRH. 9.—Facs. Wetter, xi. 9.
Fragment, on *vellum*.

35. *Alexandri Galli Doctrinale*—28 lines. 4to.
Described BRH. 570 ; Ca. 105.—Facs. MT. pl. 30.
Two leaves, on *vellum*.
36. *Alexandri Galli Doctrinale*—29 lines. 4to.
Described BRH. 571 ; Ca. 106.—Facs. MT. pl. 30.
Seven leaves, on *vellum*, which contain the verses 2144–2321, 2440–2614.
[N.B.—There are two leaves of a Doctrinale of 29 lines in the Cologne Library (see Ennen, p. 8 ; Campbell, 109) ; further other fragments of a *Doctrinale* of 29 lines, in the Library of the Catholic Gymnasium, and in the archives (see Campbell, 107 and 108). Also two leaves in the Paris Library (see Van Praet, Velins, Belles Lettres, No. 16) ; five leaves in the possession of M. Renouard, and some leaves at Oxford.]
37. *Alexandri Galli Doctrinale*—32 lines. 4to.
Described Van Praet, Velins, IV. No. 17.—No facs.
Two leaves in the Paris Library, on *vellum*.
Visser possessed also two leaves, and there are two leaves of an edition of 32 lines in the Cologne Town Library (see Ennen, p. 8).
38. *Catonis Disticha*—21 lines. 4to.
Described MT. p. 36.—Facs. Sotheby I. 135, pl. xxiv. 4. Two fragments which were in the possession of Sotheby.
39. *Pii Secundi Tractatus et Epitaphia*. Small folio.
Described MT. p. 27.—Facs. MT. pl. 23 (verso).
This tract commences on the verso of the 45th leaf of Lud. de Roma, printed in type iv. (see above, No. 25).
Copies : See above, No. 25.
40. *Guil. de Saliceto de Salute corporis ; Turrecremata de Salute animae ; Pii II. Tractatus de Amore, &c. ; Homeri Yliada, &c.*, in folio.
Described BRH. 572 ; MT. p. 3 ; 30 sqq.—Facs. MT. pl. 26 ; Renouard, Bibl. d'un Amat. II. 152–8 ; Sotheby I. p. 183 (note).
Twenty-four leaves (the first of which is blank) divided into two quires of six sheets each ; 34, 35 and 36 lines.
Copies : 1. Museum Meerman-Westreenen, at the Hague, containing the MS. note : “Hunc librum emit dominus Conrardus abbas hujus loci XXXIIII., qui obiit anno MCCCCLXXIIII, in profesto exaltationis sanctae crucis, postquam profuisset annis fere tribus.” Another MS. note indicates that this copy had belonged to the convent of St. James, at Lille. This abbat was Conrad du Moulin, who was abbat only from 1471 to 1474. 2. Earl Spencer, wanting first (blank) leaf. 3. Paris Library. 4. (M. Libri, perfect ; Qy. where now ?) 5. (The Hibbert [Hebert] copy ; Qy. where now ?)
41. (*Incerti auctoris, vulgo Pindari Thebani*), *Iliados Homericæ Epitome abbreviatum* (Metrice), *cum præfatione Pii II. in laudem Homeri*.
Described BRH. 10 ; MT. pp. 33, 34.—No facs.
Ten leaves (in quires of 4, 4, 2 leaves), 34 and 35 lines. Folio.
Copies : 1. Royal Library at the Hague, wanting the 10th leaf ; 2. British Museum, Grenville Collection.
42. *The same work*.—34 and 35 lines.
Described BRH. 573 ; MT. pp. 33 and 34.—No facs.
Seventeen leaves. Folio.
Copy : Museum Meerman-Westreenen.
Holrop, in his Mon. Typ., pp. 32–34, has given a minute and clear description of Nos. 41 and 42, which are great bibliographical curiosities.

TYPE VI.

43. *Donatus*.—26 lines. 4to.
Described Ca. 629.
Four leaves, on *vellum*, in the Library of the Catholic Gymnasium at Cologne.

44. *Donatus*.—27 lines. 4to.

Described BRH. 556 ; Ca. 631 ; where it is said that this type is the same as type V., except the P which is larger and of a different form ; MT. p. 36.—Facs. MT. pl. 31^{ab} ; Meerman, pl. II.

One leaf (the 11th), on *vellum*.

Fragments are also preserved at Haarlem. Dr. Kloss possessed the 4th and 5th leaves. Weigel also had two leaves. See Collectio Weigel. II. 165.

TYPE VII.

45. *Donatus*.—27 lines. 4to.

Described MT. p. 36.—Facs. MT., pl. 32^a.

Four leaves on *vellum*, found in the old binding of a : Durandi Rationale, printed at Strassburg, 1493, belonging to the Library of the Convent of the Holy Cross, at Uden, in North Brabant. These four leaves (2 sheets) contain the same text, and belong, therefore, to two copies of the same edition. The type resembles much that of the Saliceto.

TYPE VIII. (also called the *Abecedarium* type).46. *Abecedarium*.

Described MT. p. 16 ; Ca. 1.—Facs. MT. pl. 12.

Four leaves, 16mo, printed on *vellum*. They were found in 1751 by M. Enschedé, at Haarlem, in a MS. Breviarium of the Fifteenth Century, originating from the family of Berestyn, related to Jan van Zuren, printer at Haarlem, in 1561. At the sale of Enschedé's Library they were bought by Teyler's Museum, at Haarlem, and afterwards presented by the authorities of this Institution to the town of Haarlem, where they are now preserved in the Town Hall.

[N.B.—This little work has been regarded as the first Essay of Laurens Coster. But Bernard (*Origine*, I. 91) said that it could not be the first typographical essay, as the difficulty of *imposition* had not been surmounted, he argued, at the commencement of the art. He added that we may be certain that the first size used was folio, and that only later on printers became familiar with 4to. size, afterwards with 8vo., and finally 16mo. Mr. Holtrop says that he had, independently, come to the same conclusion. But I really do not see that there is any difficulty whatever. The *Abecedarium* consists of two sheets, or four leaves, or eight pages ; and, of course, the printer printed its eight pages one after the other, and, naturally, the pages 1 and 8 fall on the same side of the first sheet, and pages 2 and 7 on the other side, and so on. There is, therefore, no question of *imposition*, as it is now-a-days understood by printers. We might just as well say that MSS. had been *imposed*, for in MSS., too, the pages 1 and 8, and 2 and 7, &c., would come on the same sides of the sheets.]

47. *Donatus* of 31 lines. 4to.

Described BRH. 1 ; Campbell 611 (where it is wrongly described as an edition of 32 lines) ; MT. p. 15.—Facs. MT. pl. 11 ; Meerman, Tab. 1.

Two leaves, on *vellum*, printed on *one* side only, found, in 1844, in the Royal Library at the Hague, in a "Getydenboeck," printed at Delft, 1484.

[N.B.—It must be distinctly stated that the leaves are anopisthographic ; there never has been any printing on the versos, consequently the idea of any printing on the versos having been scraped off, as suggested by Messrs. Holtrop and Campbell, cannot be entertained.]

On comparing the above list with that of 1871, it will be observed that to the forty-three works enumerated in the latter list four have now been added. Of one of these additions (No. 26), printed in type iv., no title can as yet be given; but it is evidently a treatise on Canonical Law, presumably written by the same Ludovicus de Roma who wrote the *Singularia in causis criminalibus* (No. 25), also printed in type iv. Of this new work no more than a fragment of one leaf was recently discovered by Dr. P. A. Tiele, the librarian of the University of Utrecht. Another fragment printed in the same type iv. and found in the same library at Utrecht, cannot yet be identified. It does not belong to the *Singularia*, but it may belong to the other work.

The second addition (No. 13), also discovered at Utrecht, is still more curious and important, as being a *French* edition of the Grammar of *Aelius Donatus*, printed with the same types as the *Speculum* (type i.). Four leaves (eight pages, namely 1, 2, 3, 4 and 9, 10, 11, 12) of it were found last year by Dr. Samuel Muller, the archivist of Utrecht, in the binding of a MS. Cartulary of the first half of the sixteenth century. It seems probable that the edition originally consisted of six leaves, of which the third and fourth (or the pages 5, 6, 7, 8) are wanting. The two pages (4 and 9), which are now the centre pages, have both thirty lines; the other six (outer) pages (1, 2, 3, 10, 11, 12) have all twenty-nine lines.

The third addition (an edition of the *Doctrinale*; No. 17), printed in the *Speculum* type (i.) and the fourth addition (an edition of the *Donatus*; No. 43), printed in type vi. are taken from Campbell's *Annales* published in 1874.*

We have, therefore, to deal with the rather large number of forty-seven different works.

CHAPTER VIII.

WERE THE "COSTERIANA" PRINTED AT UTRECHT?

NOT one of the forty-seven Costeriana bears a date, nor the place where they were printed nor the name of the printer. Authors who believed in a Haarlem Invention of Printing have always ascribed them to Laurens Janszoon Coster (said to be the inventor of printing at Haarlem), and to a period varying, according to their confidence or ignorance, from 1423 to 1439, or from 1420 to 1439, or to 1470; or *circa* 1440; or from 1440 to 1460. Those who had no confidence in the tradition of a Haarlem invention, nor in the person of the Haarlem inventor, attributed, but always somewhat tentatively, these books to an unknown Dutch printer, and their execution to the period *circa* 1470 and later.

* The third and fourth addition had not yet been noticed by me when I prepared my articles for the *Academy*, so that I speak there of forty-five, here of forty-seven, works.

Since 1870, however, fresh and altogether novel attempts have been made to assign a *place* and a *date* to the Costeriana. At the very moment that Dr. Van der Linde was supposed to have shown that there was no foundation for the Haarlem story, and that two men had been paraded before our eyes, neither of whom would fit into the story as related by Junius, and whose career did not suggest that they could have been printers, Mr. Bradshaw suggested *Utrecht* as the place where the Costeriana had been printed, and the period 1471-1474 as the approximate date of their origin. Later on, when people considered that the story of a Haarlem invention of printing had entirely been exploded, the convent Weidenbach near Cologne, and the convent Den Hem, near Schoonhoven in Holland, were also suggested as places where the Costeriana might have been printed. The latter two places, however, were only suggested, and for a time seriously thought of, by those two fanciful writers on Bibliography, M. Madden and Dr. Van der Linde. But *Utrecht* has found, and still finds, favour with a good many authors. Mr. Bradshaw suggested or fixed upon that city, because we find the engraved blocks, or at least one of them, which had been employed before in the printing of the four editions of the *Speculum*, cut up into two portions and used there in 1481 by the printer Johan Veldener in the printing of one of his books (*Epistelen ende Evangelien*, in Dutch). Mr. Bradshaw explained why he adopted Utrecht:

"The method," he said (on p. 5 of his *List of Types used by Printers in Holland in the Fifteenth Century*) "which he adopted, prevented him from accepting any testimony at all except such printed or written documentary evidence as is found in the volumes themselves, or failing this, such evidence as is afforded by an unmistakable family-likeness between two or more founts of type . . . He was compelled to leave the *Speculum* at Utrecht until he knew anything positive to the contrary, because it is at Utrecht that the cuts first appear, cut up into pieces, in a book printed by Veldener at that place in 1481."

The opinion of Mr. Bradshaw carried great weight with me and others who knew his eminence in bibliography. Mr. Campbell, the librarian of the Hague library, was so convinced of the soundness of Mr. Bradshaw's suggestion and Dr. Van der Linde's researches in the Coster question, that, in his *Annales de la typographie Néerlandaise au XV. Siècle*, published in 1874 (a book that will last for ages, and should only have adopted established facts), he ascribed the Costeriana not to the discredited Laurens Janszoon Coster of Haarlem, and not to an unknown place, but, much against Mr. Bradshaw's own wish, to a purely imaginary *Prototypographie Néerlandaise, Utrecht*, merely indicating his doubts on the subject by a sign of interrogation.

I myself adopted Mr. Bradshaw's suggestion publicly with equally great zeal and confidence, as may be seen in my introduction to the *Haarlem Legend* published in 1871. But I admit that my researches at that time hardly enabled me to form an independent opinion; and what I am going to say will show that, unless more evidence be found, I can no longer accept Utrecht, nor the date 1471-1474 as applicable to the *Costeriana*.

Mr. Bradshaw, in suggesting *Utrecht* as the place where the Costeriana were most likely printed, was, of course, free from all party bias. He favoured neither Haarlem nor Mentz. He merely suggested what he considered a scientific method of dealing with the Costeriana.

But it stands to reason that his method, if applied to the *Costeriana*, should also be applied to other groups of incunabula, in which case the thirty-one-line Indulgence of 1454, the thirty-six-line Bible, and all the other works printed in the same type, which we at present ascribe, or feel inclined to ascribe, to Gutenberg and to Mentz, should be assigned to Albrecht Pfister of Bamberg, for the latter had unquestionably those types in his possession in 1461, whereas there is not a scrap of evidence that they were at any time in the possession of Gutenberg. Or, secondly, Mr. Bradshaw's method would compel us to place the first appearance of printing in Germany at *Frankfurt*, or at *Lübeck*, or at *Erfurt*, instead of at Mentz, as we find that Paulinus Chappe, who was commissioned by John II., King of Cyprus, for the sale of the 1454 Indulgence, issued written copies in the first two places a short time before we find printed copies of that document circulating, while the earliest of the printed copies of the Indulgence is dated from *Erfurt*. Or, thirdly, Mr. Bradshaw's method would compel us to assign the thirty-one-line Indulgence to Brunswick or Halberstadt, for it is there that we find the first two editions (evidently printed by way of experiment) used as binder's waste, which in this case may also be called printer's waste. But I suppose Gutenberg's worshippers would rather object to any such applications of Mr. Bradshaw's method, as it would entirely destroy the claims of their idol. But a method which they would consider unsound in the case of Gutenberg, they could hardly be allowed to apply in other cases. Mr. Bradshaw's death prevents us from ascertaining his views on such a scientific and general application of his method. But to me it seems certain that, when he suggested it, he never contemplated the consequences that would follow.

After Mr. Bradshaw had thrown out the hint as to Utrecht, other people found, or thought they found, confirmatory evidence of the *Costeriana* having been printed in that place. First of all, Dr. Van der Linde called attention to a MS. of the *Speculum* having been written, or, having belonged at least, to a person residing at Utrecht in 1464. Of this MS., the printed Dutch *Speculum*, he said, was an abridgment; talking just as if there had been no other MSS. of the *Speculum* on earth. Secondly, the fragments of the two works, which I mentioned above as having been discovered within the last five years, were discovered at *Utrecht*, having evidently been used as binder's waste in that city. This circumstance especially was regarded by Dr. Campbell, the librarian of the Hague, as finally settling the question in favour of *Utrecht*, and twice over he expressly went out of his way to inform the Dutch people of his opinion. Why, I do not in the least know. If the fragments were *printer's waste*, that is to say, if they were discarded proof-sheets, there would be strong *prima facie* evidence for Utrecht, as the books and the MS. in which they were found were apparently bound at Utrecht. But the fragments in question are not printer's waste. Therefore, though they may have been used by a *binder* in the strengthening or guarding of his books, they can never be a reliable clue to their *printer*, nor to the *place* where they were printed; least of all, when we consider that copies or fragments of these *Costeriana* have been found in various places: at Cologne, Brussels, Haarlem, Utrecht, &c., and in all sorts of bindings of incunabula printed at various places and in different years as—Delft (1484), Haarlem (1486), Deventer (1491, 1495), Strassburg (1493), Reutlingen (1495), and no

one would assert that these fragments were printed in all the places where they have been found. But, if the finding of fragments is to be taken as evidence, then certainly the evidence that we have in this respect is overwhelmingly in favour of *Haarlem*: (1) a fragment of one of the Costerian *Donatuses* (in type i., see above, p. 27, No. 8) was found in the *original* binding of an account-book of 1474 of the Cathedral at Haarlem, in which an entry occurs showing that the account-book had been bound by Cornelis the bookbinder, the very man who is alleged by Junius to have been the servant of the printer of the Costeriana, and who, therefore, plays an important part in the controversy regarding the invention. (2) This very same Cornelis the bookbinder, the servant of the reputed Haarlem inventor, is known to have continued to bind the account-books of the Haarlem Cathedral, and in *several* of them (one of 1476, another of 1514, &c.) he used fragments of the same *Donatus* of which he used fragments in 1473 (see A. De Vries, *Lyst der Stukken betrekkeelyk de Geschiedenis van de Uitvinding der Boekdrukkunst, berustende op het Raadhuis te Haarlem*. Haarlem, 1862, pp. 7, 9*, 11). In fact, this Cornelis seems to have had a perfect store of these *Donatuses*.† (3) Two leaves of another edition of the *Donatus* (but in the same type i.) were found at Haarlem in a MS. Cartulary, ranging from 1330–1467; (4) Two vellum leaves of an *Abecedarium* (in type viii.), presumably belonging to the same group of books, were found in a fifteenth-century MS. pertaining to a Haarlem family; and (5) Fragments of the *Saliceto* (in type v.) were found in the binding of a book printed at Haarlem in 1486. Therefore the discovery at Utrecht, twice or three times only, of fragments of the Costeriana cannot yet be accepted as evidence that these books were *printed* at that place, when we look at the much stronger evidence in favour of Haarlem; least of all when we consider that one portion of them was found by the librarian, and another by the archivist, of Utrecht, both men who have had for a considerable number of years the question of the invention before their eyes and their minds, and who are in consequence constantly on the look out for things of this kind. Remove these two men to other places, where they would have similar opportunities for examining MSS. and printed books, and the chances are that copies or fragments of Costeriana will turn up wherever they go.

* At No. 2, on p. 9, the *Lyst* wrongly gives 1489 instead of 1476.

† All these fragments discovered at *Haarlem* have been quietly overlooked by Dr. Campbell; at least he does not say a word about them, whereas he is very profuse about the discovery of fragments at *Utrecht*. And as regards Dr. Van der Linde, nothing is so deplorable in his books as his attempts to distort or explain away evidence of this kind. In his *Gutenberg* (p. 562) he first *suggests* or *presumes* that the *Costeriana* may have been printed at Cologne, and then, on the following page, speaking of the Cornelis fragments, he asks "Did the Haarlem bookbinder and bookseller Cornelis stand in any business-relations with the Cologne manufactory of *Donatuses*?" just as if, by merely *suggesting* it, he had *proved* the existence of the Cologne manufactory. In this same manner Dr. Van der Linde has *proved* all his points.

CHAPTER IX.

UNCERTAINTY AS REGARDS "DATING" THE COSTERIANA.

As regards the approximate *date* which those who do not believe in the Haarlem claims assign to the Costeriana, namely, 1471-1474, they base it first upon the appearance and workmanship of the books which they assert to be of that period. Secondly, upon the circumstance that one of the fragments of a *Donatus*, printed with the same types as the *Specula* and eleven other works, was found, as I have said above, in the original binding of an account-book of 1474 of the Cathedral of Haarlem. But as that fragment belongs to a copy that has been rubricated, and in circulation, it stands to reason that the date of its printing must be placed at least before that year. Thirdly, one of the *Costeriana* was bought by a certain Conrad, the abbat of St. James, at Lille, and as he was abbat from the end of 1471 to 13th Sept., 1474 only, the printing of the book must have been finished at least before the latter date (see the List above, No. 40).

This latter work is one of the four *Costeriana* which are printed in type v., and which cannot be dated earlier than August 19, 1458, as they bear the name of Pope Pius II. who was not elected till that day. Therefore, we are provided with at least two dates (1458 and 1471-1474) on which to base ourselves. Now, when we have a number of undated incunabula, presumably all printed in the same printing-office like the *Costeriana*, and have also one or two dates to base ourselves upon, there is in some cases a chance of our being able to group them all with more or less certainty round those dates. In the present case, having to deal with a number of forty-seven incunabula, four of which cannot be placed earlier than 1458, we should have to see whether we must group the remaining forty-three *after* or *before* or *between* the dates in our possession, or *some* of them *after*, or some *before*, or some *between* those dates. This grouping is usually done by taking into account the more or less progressive workmanship, or the more or less sharpness of the types, which is nearly always observable in the early printed books emanating from one and the same office. But such grouping is seldom very easy, and in a good many cases it can only be guess-work. For instance, it would be hopeless to try to date the earlier productions of the first Paris press by their workmanship or the look of their types, as the books are all so like each other that they would almost seem to be printed at one and the same time, without any alteration in the look of the types or any alterations in the mode of printing. Moreover, we observe now and then how very little difference the space of ten or eleven, or even more years, makes to bibliographers in assigning dates to incunabula. For instance, in 1783, the earliest date of printing at Strassburg was given by Panzer as 1471; Hain (1831) put it at 1473; Namur (1834) at 1471; in 1853 Bernard knew already the year 1466 as the earliest date; and in 1871 the date 1460 came to light, and, of course, the Bible in which the latter date was found, and which formerly

had been attributed to 1473 or thereabouts, was at once put thirteen years back.

So, again, recent bibliographers profess to have discovered evidence, which would compel us to date the books of the R printer seven or eight years earlier than they have hitherto been placed. On the other hand, for nearly eighty years a group of *seven* books have been ascribed to Gutenberg, on the strength of the printed date of a Prognostication preserved at Darmstadt, which was alleged to be 1460 (see my *Gutenberg*, p. 107, sqq.); wherefore the book, with six other works printed in the same type, were assigned to the year 1459, or thereabouts. And as long as this date remained undisputed, the appearance of the books never suggested to Gutenberg's worshippers that they were of a considerably later date, and could not be ascribed to him. But when I found in 1881 that the date of the Prognostication had been falsified, and was not 1460, but 1482 (therefore printed in 1481), all the books were at once comfortably dated twenty-one years later, and removed for ever from the list of Gutenberg productions.

Bibliographers deal with the block-books in the same way. Weigel, who did not believe in a Haarlem invention of printing, placed the *Biblia Pauperum* (a Dutch block-book) *circa* 1460-1475. Berjeau, who believed in such a Haarlem invention, argued that it could not be dated later than 1410-1420. And when we think of the Costeriana themselves, we see with what ease and comfort bibliographers take those books fifty, forty, or thirty years backwards or forwards, according to the fancy of the one or other "authority." In 1568 the *Speculum*, and some other works of Coster, were declared to have been printed *circa* 1440. Later on, their date was said to go back as far as 1423, and as long as the Germans maintained that Gutenberg had invented printing in 1440, the believers in a Haarlem invention never hesitated to put most of the Costeriana between 1423 and 1440. And in this century their antique and primitive appearance had convinced nearly every bibliographer, who laid claim to impartiality and independence of judgment, that those latter dates could not be wrong. To mention only a few: Bernard, Blades, Humphrey, whose impartiality could not be questioned, believed in a Haarlem invention (therefore) before 1440; and Holtrop, the late librarian of the Hague, did not hesitate to begin his list of the printers in the Netherlands (*Monum. Typogr.*) with "Laurent Coster, 1423-1440; Successeurs de L. Coster, 1441-1472." But when in 1870 Dr. Van der Linde told us, with an unmistakable shout of authority, that Laurens Coster had been a chandler and innkeeper and not a printer, and that the Costeriana had not been printed before 1471-1474; and that the *Speculum*, instead of being a first-fruit of the art of printing, was a very late product of it, we all bowed our heads and said, "Yes, they were printed about 1471-1474." So there was a clear jump, all at once, from 1423 (in some cases), or from 1439 (in other cases), to 1474; and no one (I myself not excepted) who adopted Dr. Van der Linde's pronouncement seemed troubled about this tremendous *salto face*.

Therefore, in endeavouring to assign dates to incunabula, we need not have any very great scruples about placing them one or two decades earlier or later, if any real or circumstantial evidence should require us to do so. In fact, I have explained before, that the earliest presses, up

to at least 1480, were established with no other object and plan than to reproduce, by a mechanical and more speedy process than handwriting, the MSS. of the period; and that, therefore, as long as that object and plan were not abandoned, no material alteration in the look of printed books could be expected. Nor do we see such an alteration. He that will compare the *Letters of Indulgence* of 1454 with the *Catholicon* of 1460, or with the earliest productions of the Paris press (1470), or with the first book of Ketelaer and de Leempt of Utrecht (1473), or with the first book of Johannes de Westphalia and Thierry Martens at Alost (1473), or with the first book of Caxton printed in England (1477), will see that printing remains, during all those years, stationary or stagnant; but that, if we observe any movement going on, it is in the direction of improvement, *not retrogression*.

CHAPTER X.

ANOPISTHOGRAPHIC PRINTING; PRINTER'S WASTE; BINDER'S WASTE.

YET such a retrogression, which is observed in no other early printer, would have to be assumed if we place all the Costeriana about 1471-1474. We should have to assume that their printer printed with movable metal types; but, some of his books anopisthographically, that is to say, in a most awkward manner, on one side only of his paper or vellum, many years after every other printer had been able to overcome this difficulty, which was unavoidable in block-printing. It is well known that the four editions of the *Speculum* have all been printed anopisthographically; but it is altogether unknown or ignored that we have anopisthographic fragments not only of *three* editions of the *Donatus* (see the List above, No. 6, 33, 47) and a Dutch version of the seven Penitential Psalms (List, No. 5), but even of an edition of the *Gul. de Saliceto de Salute corporis*, &c. (List, No. 27). This circumstance has hitherto remained obscured from our view, because the librarians at the Hague, who described these fragments, asserted that the letterpress of one side of the fragments has been scraped or rubbed away, so as to give the leaves the appearance of being printed on one side only. But such attempts, which, if they were made at all, must have been made before the end of the fifteenth century, could not possibly have been so successfully carried out, even with *one* fragment, as to leave no traces whatever of the printing. But it would certainly, be a miracle if such attempts had been made, and had all been successful, with the *five* or *six* fragments which have been discovered, not in one place, but in different places, without any connexion whatever with each other; and yet, nothing can be seen on the verso of the two leaves of the *Donatus* preserved at the Hague, nor on the two fragments of the *Saliceto* preserved in the

British Museum.* And, no doubt, the same may be affirmed of the other leaves preserved at Paris, Cologne and Brussels, though I have not seen them. I am aware that no less a man than Mr. Bradshaw said in 1871 (*List of Founts of Types*, p. 7) :

“If a fragment is found printed only on one side it has hitherto been described as ‘a remarkably interesting specimen of anopisthographic typography, probably executed in the infancy of the art, &c., &c.,’ instead of which it is simply a proof-sheet of the most commonplace description.”

But, assuming that the anopisthographically printed vellum fragments, which have hitherto come to light, were “proof-sheets,” or “spoiled sheets” of the printer, even then the printer of the Costeriana would stand alone among all the other early printers ; for, as far as I know, no such anopisthographic vellum fragments of any other printer have ever been discovered, and yet a good deal of vellum printing was executed during the fifteenth century. He alone would have been so luxurious in his habits as to use, *by preference*, vellum for his proof-sheets, which, according to our notions, he would rather have pulled on far more inexpensive paper.†

Besides the theory of the fragments having been scraped or washed, the librarians at the Hague have suggested another solution, namely, the vellum used for these works might have been so delicate and transparent as to be unfit for being printed on both sides. But then, again, the printer of the Costeriana would stand alone among all the other early printers ; for whereas every other printer managed to get properly prepared vellum for the few copies that he issued on such material, this printer of the Costeriana alone would have been so badly circumstanced that he had to be content with vellum, too delicate and too transparent for the ordinary purposes of printing, as it was customary in 1471-1474. And yet this printer of the Costeriana must be supposed to have

* In 1871, speaking, in my list of the Costeriana, of the two *Saliceto* fragments in the British Museum, I followed M. Holtrop (*Mon. typogr. des Pays-Bas*, p. 32) in saying that “the side on which at present no printing is found seems to have been scraped, to give it the appearance of a blank page.” But a few weeks ago (March 31) the authorities of the British Museum kindly loosened the fragments from their binding and so enabled me to examine the versos of them. It is quite clear that there is *no* printing on them, nor ever has been, and that, consequently, no scraping or washing has taken place. At first sight I fancied that I saw traces of printing on the back ; but on examining the letters which I imagined to see, they proved to be the traces of letters printed on the recto of the vellum, which is very transparent. As regards the two anopisthographic leaves of the *Donatus* (List, No. 47) preserved at the Hague, I had occasion to examine them carefully last January ; and it was perfectly clear to me that there is *no* printing on the reverse, nor ever has been, and that, consequently, no scraping or washing has taken place, in spite of what M. Campbell says to the contrary (*Annales*, No. 611). Moreover, M. Holtrop, when he described these fragments in his *Mon. typogr.* (p. 15) described them as being printed on one side, without saying anything about the versos, so that the idea of scraping or washing does not seem to have occurred to him, and is merely an after-thought of M. Campbell. M. Holtrop tells us, indeed (p. 15), that the first six top lines of the recto of one of the leaves have been effaced by contact with water ; but he adds, at the same time, that here and there some letters are still visible, which confirms my argument that printing may get effaced, but never so completely as to leave no traces whatever.

† *Paper* proof-sheets or spoiled sheets are found. There is, for instance, such an anopisthographic sheet of a (late) paper *Donatus* in the British Museum (Tab. xi. b. 14), which had formerly been in the possession of M. Weigel.

understood the art of printing on vellum better than anybody else, for of the forty-seven works published by him no less than thirty-four are entire editions of vellum. But we need not discuss the point further, as a renewed examination of the two *Saliceto* fragments, preserved in the British Museum, enables me to remove for ever all doubts as to the nature of these anopisthographic fragments. They have most undoubtedly been *rubricated*, as may be seen from the capitals in both fragments. Consequently they are the remains of a copy that was sold and has circulated. *Ergo*, they are neither "proof-sheets" nor "spoiled sheets," nor have they been scraped on the verso. And as one of the fragments is a piece of very strong and thick vellum, it stands to reason that the printer could not have been prevented by the delicacy of the vellum from printing on both sides. They are simply and truly the remains of a work printed, anopisthographically, by the same printer who printed, in the same manner, the four other works (besides the editions of the *Speculum*) referred to above.

Another solution has been suggested to me. Namely, these leaves, printed on one side only, are perhaps corrected *reprints* of the corresponding leaves in the book, in which case the side of the leaf which was left blank was most probably intended to be pasted on the page or pages which they, for some reason or another, were destined to replace. I confess I do not see how, for instance, the *Saliceto* fragments could be "cancels," as the edition which we know of this work is on *paper* (List No. 40), and, of course, no corrected page or pages would have been reprinted on *vellum*. Nor would it be easy to explain, if the fragments belonged to a different edition, as they certainly seem to do, how this printer could have required so many "cancels," as these fragments are evidently the third and fifth page of the work; of the *Donatus* (No. 47) there are also *two* pages, and of the Penitential Psalms (No. 5) *four* pages, printed on one side. But I record the suggestion, as I have no wish to conceal anything that might throw light on the subject. One thing is certain, the fragments in question are not "printer's waste" or discarded "proof-sheets," for, in such a case, they would not have been rubricated.

CHAPTER XI.

THE "SPECULUM."

WHEN we now turn to the four editions of the *Speculum*, and observe that they are all entirely *anopisthographic* (figures and text), and that, moreover, the text of one of them is partly *xylographic* and partly *typographic*, we meet again with difficulties when we assign them to a period beginning with the year 1471. We must then assume that their printer continued to print, perhaps for a good many years, his books partly from wooden blocks (xylographically and anopisthographically) and partly with movable metal types (typographically), many years after the former mode of printing had been practically abandoned on account of the perfection to which the latter mode of printing had been brought. It is true that in Germany block-books were printed

anopisthographically even so late as 1475, but not by printers who practised the art of printing with movable metal types.

To bibliographers like Dr. Van der Linde the peculiar and primitive condition of the four editions of the *Speculum* is no difficulty. As to their anopisthographic condition, they argue that that was natural and necessary, as the mode by which woodcuts were printed rendered the versos unfit for further operations. Very well! But the art of printing woodcuts, together with text set up in movable metal types, on both sides of the paper, was already understood in Germany so early as 1461, and it would be very strange indeed if this first Dutch printer (who, if he were not the inventor of printing, must have learned his craft in the perfect schools of printing of Germany, France, or Italy) should have been unacquainted with that art. Moreover, the pages of the preface consist, in all the four editions, wholly of *text*, without any woodcut at all; and as this preface required in the Latin editions no more than five pages, it is difficult to see why the printer, if at the time that he printed the *Speculum* he understood the art of printing on *both sides*, should have printed this preface on three sheets or six leaves (=twelve pages), whereas, if he had printed on both sides, two sheets or four leaves (=eight pages) would have been amply sufficient for his purpose. Even then he would have been able to leave (as he has done now) a blank leaf (two pages) at the beginning, and one blank page at the end of the quire to agree with and to meet the blank page with which the next quire would begin. And the way in which the preface of the Dutch editions of the *Speculum* is printed, proves that their printer knew how to be economical with his paper, because for that preface, requiring four pages only, he dispensed with the entire blank leaf at the beginning, which we find in the Latin editions, and simply left one blank page (the first) at the beginning, printing the four pages of text on the second and seventh, third and sixth pages of the quire. I believe we may infer from this peculiarity that the printer of the *Specula* did *not* understand the art of printing on both sides at the time that he produced the four editions.

And as regards the other peculiarity of one of the Latin editions being printed partly from wooden blocks (text and all) and partly with movable types, it does not trouble some bibliographers in the least. They say that either their original printer must have run short of types, or must have had an accident with certain sheets, and so decided to reprint the wanting sheets xylographically rather than go to the trouble of casting new types; or their original printer transferred his stock of printed sheets to another person, with some sheets missing, which the new proprietor supplied by printing them from blocks cut for the occasion. These explanations may do service (for one moment of argumentation) for the mixed Latin edition which has twenty xylographically printed leaves. But they are hardly applicable to the Dutch edition, which has two leaves (49 and 60) printed with types differing little, but still materially, not only from those of the other leaves of the book and the other editions of the *Speculum*, but from all the other types of the Costeriana. Surely, neither an old nor a new proprietor, if he did not think it worth his while to cast new types for twenty leaves wanting in one edition (and now supplied by block-printing), would have been so foolish as to undertake such a labour for no more than two leaves in another edition. Moreover, the argument

that a new proprietor would have considered it a more simple process to cut blocks (which would be useless for any other purpose) for the text of no less than twenty folio leaves (= forty columns), than to cast a new type (which could be used for a hundred other purposes) for the printing of these pages, might impose very well on persons who are still under the erroneous impression that the early printers required as large a quantity of type as those of the present day; but it will hardly pass muster with those who have realised that the early printers really worked with a very small quantity of type, and only needed a small quantity, as they all printed their books page by page.

All that has been said on these twenty xylographic leaves, and on the relative position in which the edition, in which they occur, stands to the edition wholly printed from movable types, as well as on the order in which the *four* editions of the *Speculum* have probably been published, appears to me very unsatisfactory. Unfortunately, the copies of the four editions are so scattered up and down different places of Europe (and America?) that it is well nigh impossible to make an adequate examination of them. Some authors assure us that the Latin edition with twenty xylographic leaves (which I shall call A) is really later than the Latin edition, which is wholly typographically printed (and which I shall call B). Ottley, who took considerable pains in examining the two editions, concluded from the breakages and cracks observable in the impressions of the woodcuts, that A is later than B, and he considered his opinion confirmed by the fact that he saw, or thought he saw, that the twenty xylographic leaves of A, were *fac-similes* of the corresponding (typographic) leaves in B. Ottley's opinion, however, about the breakages and cracks, was declared untenable by Bernard and Berjeau, who both took as much pains as Ottley to examine the two editions; but it was endorsed and adopted by Sotheby and Holtrop. When we examine the fac-similes of two identical pages of A and B which M. Holtrop has given in his *Mon. typogr.* (pl. 17 and 20), it seems clear that either of the two texts served as a model for the other; for in the first line we find *mille* printed as *nulle* in both editions, and in the second column we have in l. 10 *tupiter* without a contraction for the first *r*, and in l. 21 *mdei* for *iudei*; so that we shall perhaps not be wrong in saying that substantially A followed B, or that the latter followed A, and that the two editions have not been set up from two different MSS. When we further examine the differences between the two texts, it would seem that the compositor of B has endeavoured to produce a more contracted text than the compositor of A, and in one or two cases improved upon the latter, as, for instance, col. 2, l. 1, *daud.* (for *dauid*) against *dad.* in A; and in l. 21 *aquā*, against *aq*, with two contractions in A. M. Holtrop (*Mon. typ.* p. 22 and 23) has collected twenty-four variations between the two texts, which prove, according to him, that the differences between them are not faults of the copyist. But it does not seem to have struck M. Holtrop that, in col. 2, l. 2, A has wrongly: "Angeli occidiss³ (occidisset) derisores Christi . . .," whereas B has correctly: "Angeli occidissēt (occidissent)," &c. This correction of B seems to prove that it is later than A; for the compositor of the latter text seems to have been able to read and understand Latin, so that if he had copied B, he would hardly have deliberately altered the contracted but correct *occidissēt*, into a still more contracted and wrong *occidiss³*.

I believe a further comparison of the various readings of the two texts would yield a more trustworthy criterion as to the relative position of the two editions, than an examination of the cracks and breakages in the engravings; for the latter have been printed by a very imperfect process, and are, therefore, liable to show defects where the blocks themselves might have been perfect. But I am unable for the present to make such a comparison myself, as there is only one edition (A) within my reach in the British Museum. And as the question of the priority of the two editions does not affect my view as regards the priority of Haarlem printing, I leave it alone for the present.

Therefore, in dealing with the peculiar conditions of the Costeriana described above, and trying to account for them, we must not forget that if we place them all in a period *beginning* with 1471, and ending, perhaps, 1480, and consequently decline to accept their printer as the *inventor* of printing—that is to say, as a man who had never learned the art of printing from anybody else, and had no other specimens of printing before him—we must inevitably come to the conclusion that he wandered either from France or from Italy or from Germany into the Netherlands, and that he, a disciple of one of the perfect schools of printing then existing in those countries, would, alone among the numerous other pupils of the same schools, have so badly learned his craft that he alone prints as none other of his fellow pupils. How could we believe, for one moment, in such a state of things? It seems to me that we are driven to the conclusion that the printer of the Costeriana was a *self-taught* printer, who had never learned the art from anybody else, and, consequently, that he was the *inventor* of printing with movable types.

CHAPTER XII.

THE "DATE" OF THE COSTERIANA.

BUT it will be asked how we could separate the dates 1458 and 1471-1474, afforded us by four of the Costeriana (the works of Pius II., printed in type v.), from the remaining forty-three Costeriana in such a way as to reconcile the latter group not only with the year 1454, when printing makes its appearance in a perfect condition at Mentz, but with a still earlier date, so as to establish the priority of those forty-three Costeriana over Mentz printing. Here I must first remark, what everybody else would remark also, that the four Costeriana which cannot be placed earlier than 1458, on account of their bearing the name of Pope Pius II., need not necessarily be placed so late as 1471-1474; for the fact that one of them was *bought* during the latter period is no evidence of their being *printed* during *that period*. The date of this bought copy, however, is of the utmost value, inasmuch as it shows us that the printing had been accomplished at least before 1474.

My second remark is that these *four* Costeriana (which we *cannot* date *later* than 1474, and may have to date, perhaps, so early as 1471, if not earlier) show a kind of superiority in type and workmanship over the *forty-three* other Costeriana, which compels us to place the latter group

in an *earlier* stage than the former. This fact is, I believe, admitted by every bibliographer who has paid any attention to these books. It is true, Dr. Van der Linde is not of this opinion. He even places (p. 299 of his last work) the group of four Costeriana at the head of his list, and so makes the printer of these incunabula begin his career not before 1474. But the mere fact of his placing the various *Donatuses* (among which is one edition, fragments of which were used as binder's waste so early as the end of 1473), and *Doctrinales* and *Specula*, in type i., later than the four works of Pius II., in type v., condemns his list as a piece of buffoonery to which we need not pay any attention. Therefore, I believe, I shall not be blamed by any fair-minded opponent of the Haarlem claims, if I say that 1474 is the very latest year that we shall have to consider for four of the Costeriana, and that we are at liberty to date the remaining forty-three works *before* that year. Perhaps it is unnecessary to add that the printing of forty-three different works was not accomplished in a day or two, and that, therefore, we shall be at liberty to work our way back with them a considerable number of years *before* 1474.

Now, as there is no *direct* evidence (if the testimony of Zell and Junius is not accepted) as to the Costeriana being printed earlier than 1474, an argument as to their really being printed earlier would, practically, be impossible if we had no books whatever to compare them with. But we have such books in the early products of Mentz printing, and *they*, therefore, *shall be our guide* in determining the approximate date of the Costeriana.

Remembering then how, in the case of Strassburg printing, the workmanship of books, said to have been printed *circa* 1471 to 1474, does not forbid us to place them eleven, twelve or thirteen years earlier, when any evidence is discovered that they have really been printed so much earlier, we may begin by repeating that, in the case of the earliest incunabula, when one party assert that they were printed *circa* 1471 or even 1474, we may just as well look upon them as having been printed about 1460, when we consider that the condition under which printing was carried on during that period made it wholly stagnant, and does not afford us any sure criterion as to dates. And, certainly, when we place the forty-three Costeriana (leaving the four works of Pius II. out of the question) in point of workmanship side by side with the *Catholicon* printed in 1460 at Mentz, the latter work shows progress compared with the Costeriana. But again, the year 1460, round which we may group several of the forty-three Costeriana, with as much certainty as the *Catholicon* and other works printed at Mentz, does not mean more than 1454, when we look at the wholly stagnant condition under which printing is carried on during that period. And certainly, when we place some of the forty-three Costeriana in point of workmanship side by side with the Letters of Indulgence printed in 1454, the latter show progress compared with the Costeriana. I therefore do not hesitate to remove the latter still further back than 1454. But before I do so I wish to warn the reader that I am not speculating in the least. We have fragments of at least three editions of the *Donatus*, printed in the well-known thirty-six line Bible type, which no worshipper of Gutenberg would hesitate for a single moment to put down to him as early as 1450 to 1454. I, myself, have described these editions in my work on Gutenberg (pp. 158 and 159) from fragments preserved in the British

Museum (press mark C. 18, e. i, Nos. 2 and 5) and in the Town Library at Mentz; and I have no objection to their being attributed to the year 1450-1454, or even to 1448, as Dr. Van der Linde feels inclined to do. But when we allow Dr. Van der Linde and all other Gutenberg enthusiasts to place these *Donatuses* as Gutenberg's experiments and products about or *before* the year 1454, I do not see how they could possibly argue that none of the twenty-one editions of the *Donatus*, printed in Holland, could be dated so early, for a comparison between the Gutenberg *Donatuses*, preserved in the British Museum and at Mentz, with (some at least of) the Dutch *Donatuses* preserved in the British Museum, at the Hague, Haarlem and elsewhere, makes it clear as daylight that, in point of workmanship, those *Donatuses* stand on the very same stage, but that, if there is any difference between them, the Dutch *Donatuses* are the more primitive. We have also at least *four* editions of the *Donatus* printed by Peter Schoeffer in the forty-two line Bible type. I have described them in my work on Gutenberg (pp. 168-171) from fragments preserved at Mentz, Hanover and Paris, and explained that, on bibliographical grounds, we should ascribe them to about the same time as the forty-two line Bible, that is to say, about 1456. But when we allow Gutenberg enthusiasts to regard those *Donatuses* as printed before 1456, I do not see how they could possibly argue that none of the twenty-one editions of the *Donatus* printed in Holland could be dated so early; for a comparison between the two kinds of *Donatus* makes it clear as daylight that in point of workmanship the Schoeffer *Donatuses* stand on the very same stage as (some at least of) the Dutch *Donatuses*, but that, if there is any difference between them, the Dutch *Donatuses* are the more primitive. And when once we see, that there is no difference in point of time between the Gutenberg and the Schoeffer *Donatuses* and those printed in Holland, and that we may group the latter round the years 1450 to 1456 as certainly as the former, we could not possibly violate any bibliographical conscience in taking some of the Dutch *Donatuses*, together with some of the *Doctrinales*, &c., back to the year 1446, when we consider that the condition under which printing is carried on during the period of its greatest glory (1454-1480) is almost wholly stagnant, and especially when we consider that this stagnant condition is due *not* to the *inability* of the printers or their *inferior tools*, but to a fixed method and plan which they all followed, and from which they only began to deviate, slowly and almost imperceptibly, a quarter of a century after they themselves had publicly and loudly proclaimed to the whole earth the divine nature of their art.

CHAPTER XIII.

ZELL AND JUNIUS CORROBORATE EACH OTHER.

AND when, by comparing the Dutch *Donatuses* and *Doctrinales* with the early Mentz *Donatuses* (of 1450-1456), we realise that some of the Dutch *Donatuses* and *Doctrinales* may be placed as early as 1451 and 1446, we are reminded, in the first place, of the entries in the Diary of the Abbat of Cambray (Bernard, *Origine* I. 97), who says that in 1446 and 1451 he had bought for him, at Bruges and Valenciennes, copies of the

Doctrinale of Alexander Gallus which were “jeté en molle”—a term which can only mean (printed with types) cast in a mould, if we have regard to the way in which that very term was, in several instances (not two, as Dr. Van der Linde loves to tell us), applied to printed books for many years afterwards. And, in the second place, we are reminded of the testimony of the *Cologne Chronicle* which (in 1499) tells us (on the authority of Ulrich Zell, a printer of Cologne, and a pupil of the early Mentz school) that “the art of printing was first found at Mentz, but [so it adds distinctly] in the manner as it was *then* [in 1499] practised: the *first prefiguration*, however, the *beginning* of that Mentz art was found in *Holland* [not from *one Donatus*, or *some Donatuses*, but] from *the Donatuses*, which had been printed in that country before.” And—seeing that we can actually point to several editions of typographically printed *Doctrinales* and *Donatuses*, which (by comparison with the existing Mentz *Donatuses* of 1450-1456) may be presumed to have been printed so early as 1446, and, beyond the shadow of a doubt, by a printer in *Holland*, who printed, at least some of them, in a manner which was not customary in Zell’s time, and which had never been customary in Germany since the year (1454), when printing made its appearance in a perfect state at Mentz—we should be going out of our way if we, in the first place, discarded these *Doctrinales* and *Donatuses*, and, in the second place, distorted plain language and historical testimony by arguing, that the Abbat of Cambray and Ulrich Zell referred to *xylographically* printed *Doctrinales* and *Donatuses*. Zell could hardly have referred to *Donatuses* printed *xylographically*, as it would have been worse than childish for a man of Zell’s experience and knowledge of printing with metal types and, no doubt, of block-printing, to represent an inhabitant of Mentz as being inspired by *xylographic Donatuses* printed in Holland, rather than by German xylographic products, which he must have had at his elbow every day of his life. Or why should Zell have referred to *Donatuses* in particular, when he could have made everything more clear by saying, that the art of printing, as done in his time, originated simply from printing from wooden blocks?

And when once we see that there is truth in Zell’s account, and inquire in what town of Holland the *Donatuses* might have been printed, we could hardly avoid, I think, directing our eyes to *Haarlem*. The assertion that the invention took place there was made by Hadrianus Junius (not to mention others), more than three centuries ago, at a time when he had only *one* book before him to refer to as a proof for his assertion. This assertion, therefore, rested almost entirely on hearsay and on tradition. We know, moreover, that Junius did not profess to be a bibliographer, so that his account is not based on any bibliographical considerations or investigations. It is also wholly independent from all other traditions; for instance, it has no connexion whatever with Ulrich Zell’s account, and it is based on two books not mentioned by Ulrich Zell in any way whatever, and one of the two Junius himself seems to have known by tradition only. Junius’s account, therefore, if it had been based on a fiction, or on a falsehood, was peculiarly liable to be upset by the subsequent investigations of bibliographers; or still more by a possible discovery of books that would not have harmonised with his narrative. But the tradition of that Haarlem invention, as narrated by Junius, has lived on for more than three centuries, and during that period book after book, fragment after fragment, have gradually and

unexpectedly come to light, all printed in the very same types as the *Speculum* and *Doctrinale* on which Junius based his account, and none of them showing, either by their type or their workmanship, that they could not have been produced by that same primitive printing office from which Junius asserted that the art of printing had gone forth. And as those books and fragments discovered since Junius's time include no less than six editions of the *Donatus*—which are all printed in the same types as the *Speculum* and the *Doctrinale* mentioned by Junius, and which may, with the utmost propriety, be said to be the *Donatuses* referred to by Zell—the accounts of Junius and Zell have been linked together in no casual way, but by an identity of types which proves that the *Donatuses*, which we may say were, according to Zell, the models, the *beginning* of the Mentz printing, were printed by the same printer who printed the *Speculum*, and who, according to Junius, was the Haarlem inventor of printing. We know, moreover, that no other town in Holland has ever put forth any claim in opposition to that of Haarlem. [Nor has it at any time appeared that there ever was the smallest probability of ascribing the Costeriana to any other town in Holland, while on the other hand the repeated discovery of fragments of these books at Haarlem point to this town as their original home. It is only owing to the suggestions of a great bibliographer (whom circumstances have prevented from testing the strict and general application of his own method), and the fanciful, but wholly untutored, writings of such authors as M. Madden and Dr. Van der Linde that, within the last sixteen years, public opinion has gone astray, and Utrecht has been placed before our eyes as the town where the Costeriana might have been printed.] But it never seems to have occurred to those who suggested Utrecht, to examine Utrecht handwritings, to see whether the types of the incunabula which they wished to ascribe to that town were imitations of them; probably, because these authors laboured more or less under the idea that printers set up business with types wholly or partly *imitated* from their master's types. We still see that Dr. Van der Linde continually argues, from a resemblance of types, that such and such a printer must have learned his craft in such and such a town from such and such a master; that Ulrich Zell must have been a pupil of Peter Schoeffer, as the former's types resemble those of the latter; and that the types of Ketelaar and De Leempt, of Utrecht, remind us of those of Cologne and Louvain. He even asserts that Gutenberg must have cut the types of the 1457 Psalter, because he finds on leaf 142 a capital N and a crossed Z which resemble the same characters in the thirty-six line Bible. As if this resemblance were not found in the MSS. also!

CHAPTER XIV.

THE PRINTER OF THE COSTERIANA DID NOT BEGIN AFTER 1471.

It is admitted by every one that the Costeriana are the work of a Dutch printer, more particularly of a printer who was settled in Holland proper.

I have pointed out before, and it is moreover very well known, that the peculiarity of the eight types of the Costeriana consists in a

perpendicular stroke attached to the horizontal cross-stroke through the *t*, and an upward curl or a down stroke attached to the *r*. I am aware that the same peculiarities are noticed more or less in German block-books, and in German and Italian writings. But as two editions of the *Speculum* (Spicghel) are in the Dutch language, this fact alone proves the Dutch nationality of the Costeriana beyond the shadow of a doubt. Now, among all the fac-similes of Dutch typography (including the whole of the Netherlands, or, as we should say now, Holland and Belgium), published in Holtrop's *Monuments typogr.*, and ranging (if we exclude the Costeriana) from *circa* 1470 (or say 1473) to 1500, no trace whatever of these peculiarities is found, except in three cases only, namely, on Holtrop's plates 57, 58, and 111, where they appear in three woodcuts, and are clearly intended as imitations of antique models, as a kind of fancy, just as we see now-a-days Caxton's types imitated. But the peculiarities of which I speak are found (not as imitations, but in a very natural way) in the Dutch block-books, and in Dutch manuscripts—a circumstance which shows, I think, that the eight types of the Costeriana stand next to the time of the block-books and manuscripts. Indeed, the resemblance between the eight types of the Costeriana (which we must regard as having belonged to one and the same office, until evidence to the contrary is forthcoming) and the character figured in the texts of those block-books, of which we know that they are unquestionably Dutch, is very striking. If we compare the inscriptions of the Dutch Mary engraving, preserved in the Berlin Museum, and figured in Holtrop's *Monuments* (first plate), and the texts of the two Dutch editions of the *Ars moriendi* (British Museum, pressmarks C. 48. 1, and C. 17. b. 21), and that of the Dutch editions of the *Biblia Pauperum*, and that of the Dutch *Cantica Canticoorum*, one feels almost inclined to say that the man who cast the types of the Costeriana engraved also the blocks for those block-books.

I have already pointed out before that those, who suggested Utrecht as the place where the Costeriana might have been printed, never thought of examining Utrecht MSS. to see whether the types of the Costeriana, which have such a peculiarly national form, and could not very well have been imported from Germany, nor from France or Italy, resembled in any way Utrecht MSS. I have made some enquiries on this point myself, and I have been (provisionally) informed, that the MSS. written at Utrecht do not bear any resemblance to the types of the Costeriana. But I do not wish to lay any stress on this information, as I do not know whether my informant quite understood what I had in view. But this kind of negative is not without some importance, in connexion with one or two facts which I have accidentally found myself, and which, most decidedly, point to *Haarlem* as the place where the Costeriana may have been printed. Namely, in the binding of a MS. Register of (strange to say) 1446, preserved in the Haarlem Archives, I found, last January, a vellum fragment, the writing of which made me think for a moment that I had one of the Costerian printed *Donatuses* before me. I would also recommend the inspection of the writing of slips bound in the MS. Register of 1440, and that in the Register for 1444. A comparison of the writings found on these slips will not, I think, be favourable to the Utrecht theory.

There is, as far as we know at present, a total absence of *colophons* (if we except such words as *explicit*) in the Costeriana. This circumstance

also tends to show, that the printer of these works must be placed next to the period of the manuscripts and early block-books, and not after or during the time when colophons (in verse and in prose) may be said to have become customary. I will, however, not dwell upon this absence, in confirmation of my opinion that the printer of the *Costeriana* was the *first* printer, because of most of the *Costeriana* we possess fragments only, and there are, besides, a good many other works, printed by other printers, without place, name of printer, and date. But I wish to point out that we have at least ten complete *Costeriana*, besides the last leaves of some others, and I do not know that there exists, *after* 1471, any other group of so many books issued by one and the same printer, without having in one of them either a place, or the printer's name, or a date. And even in the *late* block-books, published (in Germany) after 1470, we do find initials of the printer, or his full name, or a date.

There is another circumstance to which I must call attention in particular. Of the forty-seven *Costeriana* which have been preserved to us, no less than thirty-five (counting among this number the edition of *Saliceto*, of which only vellum fragments are found) are printed on vellum. And, from the fact, that hitherto never any paper copies or fragments of these works have come to light, it is, I think, not unreasonable to conclude that never any paper copies have been printed.* Of the remaining *Costeriana*, five (namely, the four editions of the *Speculum*, and the two leaves of one of the Dutch editions of the *Speculum*, which have been printed in a different type, counting them as one work) are partly or wholly *block-printing*, and were, therefore, necessarily, or as usually printed on paper. And only seven of them are printed on paper in the ordinary way, as we see it done, say, from 1455 to 1470. Among the latter happen to be just those works which, as I have said before, cannot be placed earlier than 1458. When we now look at the printing in Germany from 1454 to 1475, we see that the first two dates (1454 and 1455) appear in two editions of Indulgences, of which no paper copies have ever been found, and probably never have been printed. Besides these two vellum Indulgences (one of which we may ascribe to Gutenberg, the other to Schoeffer), we have also on *vellum* three editions of the *Donatus* in the thirty-six line Bible type (which I will ascribe to Gutenberg); four editions of the *Donatus* in the forty-two line Bible type; and an edition of the Psalter of 1457 (all done by Schoeffer). But in the year 1454 we find, already, printing done in Germany on *paper* and, with the exceptions just mentioned, I do not think that any more early printers issued entire editions on vellum after 1457. If, therefore, we tabulate the early printers according to the entire *vellum* editions known to have been issued by them, we are compelled to assign the *first* place to the *printer of the Costeriana*, with thirty-five works out of forty-seven published by him; the *second* place to Peter Schoeffer, with only six (or seven, including the forty-two line *Cantica*) works out of I don't know how many; while Gutenberg comes in the *third* place with four entire editions on vellum out of eight printed by him, or at least ascribed to him. I know of no printer to be put fourth, as I know of no other early printer ever having printed entire editions of any of his works on vellum, though nearly every printer of any significance

* The Abbat of Cambray, however, bought *paper* copies of the *Doctrinale*.

printed a few vellum copies of his most important works by the side of his paper copies.

I have to point out that the thirty-five vellum editions of the printer of the Costeriana include twenty-one editions of the *Donatus*, eight editions of the *Doctrinale*, two of *Cato*, one *Abecedarium*, one liturgical work, one Dutch edition of the Penitential Psalms, and one edition of *Guil. de Saliceto*. Leaving the latter work out of account, it is just of these school books and books of devotion that other and later printers issued also apparently entire vellum editions, as no paper copies have as yet been found by the side of the vellum copies. For instance, Dr. Campbell, after having described the Costerian *Donatuses*, enumerates in his *Annales* (under numbers 642, 643, 648, 649, 650, 651, 652) seven other editions of the *Donatus* printed by various printers on vellum, till close upon 1500. And of the *Doctrinale* of Alexander Gallus he mentions (No. 110 and 111) two editions besides those which concern us. Mr. Holtrop (*Monuments*, p. 18) says that there exists an edition of the liturgical work, printed also on vellum at Leiden about 1500. So it is possible that there was, as it is alleged, an idea among printers and the public in general, that books of this kind required to be printed on stronger material than those which were not used in schools. But just about the period, 1471–1474, when the printer of the Costeriana is said to begin, or to be printing, paper editions of the *Donatus* had already appeared, for which reason his entire vellum printing at that date begins to look strange.

But if we assume that he commenced his work before 1454—that is to say, if we assume him to be the inventor of printing—then he was a man who was more accustomed to MS. vellum books and his position at the head of the vellum printers becomes a natural one. We can then understand that he prints, and continues to print, on vellum because, except for block-printing, he hardly knows of any other material for the production of books, and also because he started with the idea of imitating, as closely as possible, his MSS. We can then also see that, after printing is brought to Mentz, nothing but vellum is used for a little while. But there, under fresh eyes, who see that another mode of printing could be devised, the printing on less expensive paper gradually, though slowly, takes the place of that on vellum, the latter material being only reserved, as a kind of luxury, for the production of a few copies of certain works of importance, and perhaps also, by way of tradition, for the *Donatuses* and a few other school-books.

As to the question, that the manner in which the engravings of the *Speculum* have been executed, and the dresses, hats, &c., figured on them, all point, as some say, to a period after 1471, I believe it may be met by the opinion of others who think that everything points to a much earlier period. The subject is too extensive than that I should feel competent to deal with it at this moment and in this series of articles. Suffice it to say that, so far as I have investigated the matter, I see certainly nothing in the style of the engravings of the *Speculum* which is incompatible with the much earlier period, in which the four editions of the *Speculum* must, in my opinion, be placed, on account of the anopisthographic and altogether primitive manner in which they have been printed.

CHAPTER XV.

ZELL'S STATEMENT IN THE "COLOGNE CHRONICLE" OF 1499.

I HAVE now endeavoured to demonstrate, that, if we place the printer of the Costeriana and his products in a period *commencing* with the year 1471 and ending several years afterwards, we find him and them cut a very strange figure indeed among the other printers and the other products of that period. But when we place him and, at least, some of his works about and before 1454, that is to say, if we acknowledge him as the inventor of printing, and some of his works as the *firstfruits* of the art of printing, we are able, forthwith, to reconcile a variety of circumstances, traditions, and accounts, which will otherwise remain hopelessly at variance with each other, and with a period of 1471 to 1474, and later.

If we place some of the Costeriana about and before 1454, we make them (in accordance with the statement of the *Cologne Chronicle*) the *first prefiguration*, the *beginning* of Mentz printing, and have the key to the *perfection* of the Mentz products, which we observe already at the moment that the art of printing makes its appearance there.

If, however, we refuse to date the Costeriana so early, and to accept them as the models of Mentz printing, this perfection of Mentz printing will always be regarded as an inexplicable fact. Moreover, in such a case, we are compelled to act in the most extraordinary manner. In the first place, we should have to say that (though bibliographically speaking some of the Dutch *Donatuses* cannot be said to differ in point of time from those printed by Gutenberg and Schoeffer, yet in order to satisfy some theory) we declare the Dutch *Donatuses* to have been printed *circa* 1471-74, therefore about twenty or thirty years later than the Mentz *Donatuses*. Our next step would be, of course, to declare that the *Specula* and the *Doctrinales*, and all the other Costeriana, which cannot be separated from the *Donatuses*, were likewise not printed before 1471-47. And when once we have satisfied ourselves that, though these arguments are not usual and rather militate against our bibliographical conscience and all the rules of science, yet are extorted from us by the exigencies of the Gutenberg theory, and have, accordingly, brushed the Dutch *Donatuses*, and the *Specula*, and the *Doctrinales* completely out of our sight, we smilingly say to anyone who dares to call our attention to Ulrich Zell's testimony in the *Cologne Chronicle* of 1499 :

"But, my dear Sir, there are no *Donatuses* printed in Holland, that Zell could possibly refer to as having been the 'prefiguration' or the 'beginning' of Mentz printing, for those that you are thinking of were printed long after the invention of printing had been made at Mentz. Zell has been mistaken in every one of his particulars; he meant *Donatuses* printed from wooden blocks, not from movable types, and when he spoke of Holland he meant Flanders!"

And if anyone should have the courage to refer to Junius's account of the Haarlem invention, we simply declare that his whole account is a fable, a legend, a myth from beginning to end. And if anyone should hesitate and murmur that, though some of Junius's particulars

appear doubtful, and even wrong, yet a good many of the genealogical and bibliographical particulars mentioned by him have absolutely turned out to be true, and that this could not have been the case if everything had been a falsehood, we reply that Junius also related particulars about a mermaid, and tells us that a woman had given birth to 365 babies at one and the same time, and that, therefore, everything else mentioned in his *Batavia* must be a fable also.

In other words, if we refuse to date (some at least of) the Costeriana before Mentz printing, we are compelled to deal with Zell's account in the *Cologne Chronicle* in a manner which would not be allowed in any other case. We should have to say that this man, whose utterances as regards Gutenberg and Mentz printing are regarded as Gospel-truths, went completely off his head the moment he spoke of Dutch *Donatuses*, and *said* something quite different from what he *meant*, or, rather, referred to something that he omitted to say.

In fact, desperate attempts to distort and discredit Zell's account have been made at all times, and by various authors. As long as no typographically printed *Donatuses* had been discovered, the opponents of the Haarlem claims pointed exultingly to this want of evidence in proof of Zell's allegation, who, therefore, so they said, could only have meant xylographically printed *Donatuses*. Now that we have the very *Donatuses*, which were formerly (when people fancied that they did not exist) emphatically demanded as the only means of substantiating Zell's assertion, the opponents of the Haarlem claims turn round and say : (1) that Zell must have meant Flanders when he spoke of Holland ; (2) that he could only have meant xylographic *Donatuses*, as otherwise his account would be contradictory in itself, ascribing the invention of printing to two persons and to two different places ; (3) that he was a pupil of Peter Schoeffer, the rival of Johan Gutenberg, and, therefore, wished to detract from the latter's glory ; and (4) lastly, some ingenious editor of the *Cologne Chronicle* professes to have discovered that Zell, though he is expressly named as the author of the substantial part (the beginning and progress of printing) of the passage in the *Cologne Chronicle*, did not suggest it after all. Explanations and applications of this astounding feat of interpretation may be read in Dr. Van der Linde's last two works on printing, and his explanations and interpretations are echoed by all those who wish to acknowledge Gutenberg as the inventor of printing.

There is, of course, *contradiction* in the account of the *Cologne Chronicle*, if we were to take it as a whole, because it apparently tells us in the first instance (1) that the art of printing was invented at Mentz in 1440 ; and it then goes on to say (2) that from 1440 to 1450 the art and all that belonged to it was investigated ; and it continues to say (3) that in 1450 people began to print ; the first book that was printed being the Bible in Latin ; then follows the important contradiction (4) that, although the art was discovered at Mentz, as is said before, in the manner as it is now [1499] customary ; yet the *first prefiguration* was found in Holland out of the *Donatuses*, which had been printed there before that time [1450], and from and out of them was taken the *beginning* of the aforesaid art, and it has been found much more masterly and more exact (*subtilis*) than that [other = in Holland] manner was, and has become more and more artistic ; then follows (5) a contradiction of Nic. Jenson being the inventor of printing ; then, again (6), an assertion that the

first discoverer (*vinder*) of printing was a citizen of Mentz, who was born at Strassburg and named "jonker Johan Gudenburch"; then (7) an assertion that the art of printing spread from Mentz to Cologne, Strassburg and Venice; finally (8), the information of the compiler that the beginning and progress of the aforesaid art had been verbally related to him by the upright man, master Ulrich Zell of Hanau, still a printer at Cologne in 1499.

Now, it is admitted, even by Dr. Van der Linde (in fact, it is clear from the wording), that statement No. 1 was copied by the compiler of the *Cologne Chronicle* from Hartmann Schedel's *Chronicle*, published in 1493; that statement No. 2 was written by the same compiler as a transition from statement 1 to 3; that statement No. 3 was made by Ulrich Zell. And rational people would come to the conclusion that statement No. 4 was also made by him. But no; statement No. 4 is declared to have been written down by the compiler of the *Cologne Chronicle*, just as if the latter himself did not distinctly say that the beginning and progress of the art had been told him by Ulrich Zell.

I think it must be plain to everybody that if we remove statement No. 1, which is admitted to have been copied from Schedel's *Chronicle*, the whole passage in the *Cologne Chronicle* becomes quite clear; in fact, it is not in the least obscure, unless we shut our eyes and decline to have anything to do with the Haarlem tradition. We see that the compiler of the *Cologne Chronicle* took counsel with Ulrich Zell as to the art of printing, and that Zell told him certain things about those *Donatuses* which he would not, or could not, reconcile with the statements which he found printed in the historical books at his disposal. So he copied first Hartmann Schedel's statement (1), and inserted No. 2 in order to reconcile statements Nos. 1 and 3. But when we remove Nos. 1 and 2, and also regard Nos. 6, 7 and 8, as the compiler's statements, as they certainly appear (even to Dr. Van der Linde) to be, what is there to prevent us from accepting statements 3 and 4 as Zell's utterances? They actually relate the beginning and progress of the art of printing, which the compiler, as he says, had heard from Zell.

We should, of course, have to reject or to doubt Zell's statements, if we had no *Donatuses* which could be said to have been printed in Holland before people printed at Mentz. I, for one, should even feel inclined to reject Zell's statement, if, after nearly four hundred years, we had found only *one Donatus* printed in Holland, because Zell speaks in the plural, of the *Donatuses*. But we have several editions of the *Donatus*, which have undoubtedly been printed in Holland. These *two* circumstances (the plurality of the *Donatuses* and the fact that they were printed in Holland) agree, therefore, with Zell's statements. But those who wish to reject his testimony tell us, that the *Donatuses* printed in Holland have not been printed before people printed in Mentz. I have endeavoured to demonstrate, that some of the *Donatuses*, printed in Holland (and exactly those which are printed in the same types as the *Speculum*, on which Junius based the Haarlem tradition), may be said to be at least as old as the Gutenberg and Schoeffer *Donatuses* and that, if we grant so much, the Dutch *Donatuses* may then be said to be older than the Mentz *Donatuses*, for no difference can be detected between the printed books of the period 1454 to 1477. It is clearly the duty of the opponents of Zell's testimony to say why the Dutch *Donatuses* should be dated later than the Mentz *Donatuses*.

We should, of course, have also to reject Zell's statements, if the *Donatuses*, which we may fit into his account, differed, even in the minutest particular, from the books on which the claims of Holland (= Haarlem) are based by a tradition handed down to us by Junius, and which cannot be said to have derived, in any sense of the word, its particulars from Zell or from the *Cologne Chronicle*. If, for instance, the *Speculum* and the *Doctrinale*, on which Junius based the Haarlem (= Holland) claims, could be declared, with any degree of certainty, to have been printed not earlier than 1480-1490, I, for one, should certainly abstain from saying one word more. But when we see the opponents of the Haarlem claims themselves admit that the printing of those works could not very well be placed later than 1471-1474, then we may be allowed to ask them, what difference they can point out between the printing and workmanship of these Dutch and the German incunabula produced between 1454 and 1474, which would compel us to date those printed in Holland *later* than those printed in Germany. Or I for one should abstain also from saying one word more, if the types of the *Speculum* and the *Doctrinale*, on which Junius based the Haarlem (= Holland) claims, differed, in the minutest particular, from the types of the *Donatuses* which we may fit into Zell's account. But we know that the types of the three works mentioned, independently, by Zell and Junius, are identical, and, therefore, forbid us to separate Zell's account from that of Junius.

But, really, the opponents of the Haarlem claims have realised themselves the difficulties of rejecting Zell's account, or of not ascribing it to him; otherwise they would not suggest, at the very moment that they deny that Zell wrote the statements, that Zell meant xylographically printed *Donatuses*. Least of all would they have suggested that Zell had been a pupil of Peter Schoeffer, the rival of Johan Gutenberg, and therefore, wished to detract from the latter's glory. Here I really feel inclined to agree most heartily with Dr. Van der Linde and all other opponents of the Haarlem claims; for if Zell had actually been animated with such an animus against Gutenberg, he really could not have chosen a surer basis for his opposition to his enemy's glory, than the *Donatuses* printed in Holland before people printed at Mentz. They surely not only detract from Gutenberg's glory, but they destroy his claims to the invention altogether. Dr. Van der Linde and other opponents of the Haarlem claims, in suggesting this enmity on Zell's part, forget to tell us why Zell, the so-called pupil of Peter Schoeffer, in wishing to injure Gutenberg's reputation, should have ascribed the first prefiguration of Mentz printing to non-German *Donatuses*, or to any *Donatuses* at all, or to xylographic *Donatuses* in particular. Why should he not have said (if he meant xylographic *Donatuses*) that Gutenberg took his inspiration from block printing? Or, when he set about making a false statement, and wished to injure Gutenberg, why should he not have said that Schoeffer's *Donatuses* were the first prefiguration? I believe there is only one answer to all these questions, and a good many others that may be asked: Zell was speaking the truth to the compiler of the *Cologne Chronicle*, and the truth of his account is proved by the *Donatuses* which we possess, and which were printed in Holland before people printed at Mentz.

CHAPTER XVI.

THE HAARLEM TRADITION.

IT will have been observed that, in trying to assign a date to the Costeriana, I have not placed them earlier than 1446. This I have done on account of the *Doctrinales*, mentioned by the Abbat of Cambray as having been bought by him in that year and in 1451. And as I am not aware of any of the titles of the Costeriana being mentioned earlier, in any document, with some additions which might suggest to us that there was question of printed works, I do not think it necessary to enquire whether the Costeriana (or some of them) might not be earlier. We read, indeed, of a MS. Catalogue that belonged to Jean des Roches, who wrote an essay on the origin of printing in *Mémoires de l'Académie de Bruxelles*, i., pp. 536 and 540, and who regarded this catalogue as of the fifteenth century. Among its titles was "Item *Dominicalia* in parvo libro stampato in papyro, non scripto," while at the end of the MS. Des Roches read: "Anno Domini 1340 viguit qui fecit stampare Donatos." Bernard, who quoted these entries (i. 91), thinks that we must read 1440 instead of 1340, as the catalogue is said to be of the fifteenth century, which is, moreover, plain from the use of Arabic numerals. But not having access to this MS. catalogue, and being unable to examine it, I merely draw attention to these entries, in order that they may not be forgotten, and be verified if the MS. is still in existence.

It is a singular thing, which deserves to be noticed, that when we work our way back to 1446, we touch not only the year in which the Abbat of Cambray bought printed *Doctrinales*; but, what is still more remarkable, the very year in which Laurens Janszoon Coster is asserted to have "brought the first print into the world." This assertion and the year are found on an old pedigree* of Coster and his family preserved at Haarlem. It was made for an inhabitant of Haarlem (Gerrit Thomaszoon), who asserted to be a descendant of L. J. Coster, and who died in 1563 or 1564. Dr. Van der Linde professes not to understand the phrase on the pedigree, though it is plain to anybody who desires to understand it. Nor does he attach any weight to the document; and at one time says that it was forged in the nineteenth century, at another time that it originated late in the sixteenth century, while in his last book he asserts that it could not have been written later than 1520. It is to be remarked that this last assertion is made by the same Dr. Van der Linde who invariably tells us that the Haarlem tradition is not older

* The original year, 1446, inscribed on the pedigree, has been altered, by some person unknown, into 1440. Dr. Van der Linde has commented upon this alteration at great length and with great severity. But I do not see that this circumstance is of any consequence, for, even if the alteration had been effected by the original writer of the pedigree, it would only show the uncertainty which prevailed then, and even now, with respect to the *exact* date of the invention of printing. And if the alteration has been made long after the compilation of the document, by persons who thought that 1446 was a mistake for 1440, it is hard to see how this circumstance could detract from the value of the pedigree.

than 1561. It is, moreover, curious to notice with what learning Dr. Van der Linde discusses the pedigree, notwithstanding the enormous difference in the dates, which he assigns to the document, shows that he has no knowledge of such things. And it is an open secret that what he says about it has all been suggested to him by others, and he changes his dates just as it suits his purpose. However, the date 1520 seems to have been suggested to him by persons who ought to know, and, what is of still greater value, it seems to agree with the internal and external circumstances connected with the document. Therefore, the Haarlem authorities will do well to preserve the document carefully, and we ought to bear its date and statement in mind, whenever we deal with the tradition of the Haarlem invention of printing.

In working our way back to 1446, we touch, moreover, the year which we obtain by deducting the one hundred and twenty-eight years, which Junius mentions in his text (*habitavit ante annos centum duodetriginta Harlemi Laurentius Joannes cognomento Aedituus Custosue*), from the date (1575) of his prefaces to the *Batavia*. But on this circumstance I can lay no stress for the present, because those who have examined the two transcripts of Junius's original draft of the *Batavia*, which still exist at Haarlem and the Hague, say that the account of the Haarlem invention must have been written in 1568, and that the prefaces dated 1575 are a later addition.

It behoves me to say a few words as to the man (or men) who have been regarded as the Haarlem inventor of printing. Since 1870, Dr. Van der Linde has endeavoured, in three different works, to create the impression that Laurens Janszoon Coster, mentioned by Junius as the inventor, was altogether a myth; and he has succeeded so well, that I am constantly asked by otherwise well-informed persons (1) how I could think of setting up a person who was entirely legendary; (2) could I show, from any genuine document, that such a person had ever existed? &c. In fact, Dr. Van der Linde has even succeeded in persuading himself that this Coster was a myth, as he always uses this word in speaking of Coster. But, if he can be said to have proved anything, he has proved that Coster was certainly not a myth. It is true that, if his figures are correct, the Haarlem people and the authors who have written on the subject before 1870, have dealt with the tradition of the invention and the reputed inventor in a very reckless manner, by mixing up two totally different men. On the other hand, it would be worse than useless to base any arguments or speculations upon such works as that of Koning of 1816, and least of all upon those of Dr. Van der Linde published from 1870 to 1886, which latter I have shown to be simply a reproduction of the old errors of 1816, with some new ones of his own added. But if we accept so much of Dr. Van der Linde's figures as have been corroborated to some extent by other writers, it would seem that there lived at Haarlem a "Lourens Janszoon" from about 1380 to 1439, who is duly authenticated by entries in the original Haarlem Registers and other documents. This man began to be regarded by the Dutch as the man indicated by Junius as the inventor of printing, when they considered, against the account of Junius, that the invention had taken place so early as 1423. This man is, moreover, regarded as the "lou janssn" whose burial is recorded in a Haarlem Burial Register of 1439. But "Lourens Janszoon" was a very important personage in Haarlem history; and I have shown in my third chapter (p. 11) that the burial

entry of 1439 has hitherto been misunderstood, and points to a man whose relatives were unable to pay the costs of his burial, which makes it doubtful whether the man, who was buried in 1439, is the same as the Lourens Janszoon who has been traced back as far as 1380.

But, however this may be, it seems certain that this man was merely called "Lourens Janszoon," and never "Lourens Janszoon Coster," and Junius says that this latter name was that of the Haarlem inventor. That there was such a man living at Haarlem, from 1436 to 1483, therefore, exactly at the time that printing must have been invented there, is established by Dr. Van der Linde himself, if he can be said to have established anything. He professes, moreover, to have established, that the genealogy of this L. J. Coster perfectly agrees and tallies with the chief person (Gerrit Thomaszn), mentioned by Junius as a descendant of Coster. Under these circumstances one feels inclined to ask what objection Dr. Van der Linde can have against this man, especially as all the other genealogical particulars mentioned by Junius are correct?

Ah, says Dr. Van der Linde, though all this is in perfect historical and genealogical order, yet this Coster could not have been an inventor of printing or a printer, because he was a chandler and an innkeeper. I do not see that we need trouble ourselves much about such an argument, because the inventor of printing had necessarily to be something different from a printer. We could scarcely begin to argue that printing could only have been invented by a printer? We have seen in Chapter IV. (p. 16), that a Bishop of Liège and his sister, a nun, possessed, in the first half of the fifteenth century, instruments for printing images and pieces of texts, from which we may infer that "printing" (that is, in this case, block-printing) at that time was done more by private persons than by ordinary mechanics (printers, *prenters*). And if a bishop and a nun possessed instruments for *printing* (though it was block printing), I do not see why a chandler should not have been in possession of some apparatus for printing with movable types, an apparatus which, no doubt, was more developed than that required for block printing, but at the same time only needed to be very small to satisfy the wants of that time.

It would be a more serious objection to Junius's account, suppose that we were absolutely bound to pin him to all his dates and biographical particulars, that this Lourens Janszoon Coster resided (I can only quote Dr. Van der Linde) at Haarlem from 1436 (when he occurs as inheriting a chair in a club) till 1483, when he was not yet too old to depart from Haarlem. Such a man could hardly have been a grandfather already in 1440, when he invented printing, according to Junius, by attempting to instruct his grandchildren. And it seems that Junius had really the year 1440 in his mind; because he asserts that the thief who stole Coster's types printed with them in 1442 (a year after the theft) at Mentz. If Junius had said "1452," and if we could date the invention of printing according to the date of his preface, there would be *nothing* against his account. But, without a further investigation as to the circumstances under which Junius wrote and the transcripts of his work were made, I scruple to make any suggestions. I only wish to remark that we shall, perhaps, have to deal with Junius's dates and statements very much in the same way as with those in the *Cologne Chronicle*; that is to say, those which have been derived from Chronicles and printed sources will have to be sifted from those derived from more trustworthy sources.

CHAPTER XVII.

GUTENBERG WAS NOT THE INVENTOR OF PRINTING.

LET us now see whether—(1) the assertion of the *Cologne Chronicle* “that the *Donatuses* printed in Holland were printed before there was any printing in Mentz [consequently, that the invention of printing was made in *Holland*, not at Mentz],” and (2) the assertion of Junius, “that it was made at Haarlem,” and (3) my own contention (based on what I venture to call the very strong circumstantial evidence which I have detailed above) that both the *Cologne Chronicle* (= Ulrich Zell) and Junius are in the main correct, and that printing was invented at Haarlem,—are contradictory, in any sense of the word, to the so-called documentary evidence that we have regarding Gutenberg, and to the assertion that he invented printing at Mentz in Germany.

Those who believe in an invention of printing by Gutenberg, always point out to us that up to 1561 the whole world was unanimous on that point. So it was, if we except such a trifle (!) as the contradiction in the *Cologne Chronicle* of 1499. But when we trace this unanimity to its origin and its source, it begins to assume quite a curious aspect. The earliest document which allows us to connect Germany, Gutenberg, and Mentz with the art of printing, is the Notarial document of November 6, 1455, recording the decision in the lawsuit between Johan Gutenberg and Johan Fust. By the mouth of Johan Fust it speaks of “the work” and of “our common work”; by the mouth of Johan Gutenberg it speaks of “tools” in preparation, of “servants’ wages, house-rent, vellum, paper, ink, &c.,” and of “such work,” and of “the work of the books”; while by the mouth of the judges it speaks of “the work to the profit of both of them” and of “their common use”; but none of the persons concerned in the affair say a single word about an “invention,” or about a “new mode” of printing. And yet the occasion was such as to make it almost imperative on Gutenberg to say at least *one* word about his “invention,” if he had made any, for he had spent one thousand six hundred guilders (no trifle in his days) of another man’s money, apparently without having printed anything, and was on the point of being robbed and having taken away from him all that he had made and done to give effect to his “grand idea.” And Fust, would he not have considered it necessary to explain, that he had trusted Gutenberg with so much money in order to give effect to an entirely new “invention,” if Gutenberg had made any? Would it not have been considered very creditable to Fust, if he were known to have assisted an “inventor” with money, all the more as there was already another man (Peter Schoeffer) printing at Mentz, who might arrogate the honour of the invention to himself?

Before we consider the next document, a few more words may be devoted to this lawsuit and Dr. Van der Linde’s latest utterances about it. In his last book he argues that Fust, the shrewd and calculating Fust, could not be supposed to have advanced even the first eight hundred guilders to Gutenberg, unless the latter had produced something tangible, some product of his “invention,” to show its reality. Dr. Van der Linde sees this product, this first fruit of the “invention,” in a

Donatus of twenty-seven lines, printed in the well-known thirty-six line Bible type, two leaves of which were discovered at Mentz, and are now preserved in the Paris library. He gives a full-page fac-simile of it (*Geschichte*, III. 813), and informs us, with great simplicity, that the first nine lines are printed with too soft types of lead and show the rapid wearing out of the types by printing; in the next nine lines the types are less worn out, while in the lines 19-24 the types are quite new, while the types of the last three lines are manufactured with the same punches, but cast of better metal. His fac-simile actually shows something resembling this description, but Dr. Van der Linde, who evidently dislikes any original research, has taken his fac-simile, not from the original page, but from a fac-simile published in 1840 by Duverger.

To ordinary bibliographers such a page must appear a veritable wonder. We have always been taught that types produce a very sharp and new impression, when they are used for the first time; that they get gradually blunter by use, and look at last quite worn out. We may observe these three stages, when we examine the books of any printer from the time of the invention down to the present day. But these three stages are usually observed in different books of one and the same printer, and they sometimes enable us to date the books accordingly. Or if a book is very large, we may observe the three stages, or at least the first two, in one and the same book. But here we are told that the three stages of the type occur *in one page*. How are we to explain this? Dr. Van der Linde does not think it necessary to do so. Did Gutenberg cast first some types to print the lines 19-24, leaving space for the three bottom lines (25-27), and did he use those afterwards for the lines 10-18, then for the nine top lines, and finally added the three bottom lines in types of better metal? Such a proceeding, odd as it may seem, would effectively account for the three stages of the type being found on one and the same page. It would also show us how weak and soft Gutenberg's types must have been, in the first instance, to get used up by printing a few lines. And, of course, if we assume all this, there can be no earthly doubt about this *Donatus*, or this page of a *Donatus*, being the first specimen of Gutenberg's "invention," which he probably deposited, in 1448, in the Mentz library, to enable Dr. Van der Linde to prove, in 1886, that he, Gutenberg, invented the art of printing. But the process of beginning to print a page with the bottom lines and ascending gradually higher, is so strange that one feels inclined to look for another explanation. Gutenberg could not have begun with the top lines, as they are printed, says Dr. Van der Linde, with worn-out types, or were they worn out by the printing of the previous pages, and did Gutenberg renew his types while composing this page? I confess that I am puzzled, and as Dr. Van der Linde does not think it necessary to speak of the other three pages, not even of the one which must be on the back of this marvellous page, we shall have to wait for further information. Dr. Van der Linde has just raised or tried to raise Gutenberg to the rank of a god; Gutenberg=Wotanberg (see his last work, vol. iii., p. 748), and it is just possible that this god commenced his *Donatus* in the ordinary way, with the top lines, and that the types became, miraculously, sharper and sharper as he went on

But let us be serious. Dr. Van der Linde asks us to assume that Gutenberg showed this *Donatus* as a specimen of his art to Fust, to induce the latter to lend him money for carrying his "invention" into effect.

He also asks us to assume that the *Donatus* was printed *circa* 1448, and Fust, it is calculated, began to advance money (eight hundred guilders) to Gutenberg about 1449. We know from the Notarial document of the 1455 lawsuit that Fust advanced the first eight hundred guilders to enable Gutenberg to "preparc tools," and that he further undertook to pay *annually*, three hundred guilders to defray "costs," and would also find "servants' wages, house rent, vellum, paper, ink, &c." Now, come! If we assume that Gutenberg bewitched Fust to provide all this money by *showing* him this *Donatus*, this wonderful *Donatus*, it stands to reason that we must first of all suppose that Gutenberg had actually *printed* it, otherwise I do not see how he could *show* it to anybody. But he could not have printed it without having had *the types and a press, ink, &c., &c.* And, of course, if he had *the types* for the *Donatus*, he must also have had the punches and the matrices, or whatever tools he employed for making his types. In short, in order to produce this *Donatus*, this "specimen" of his "invention," he must have been in possession of everything necessary for the printing of his thirty-six line Bible; only for the latter work he required a *somewhat* larger quantity of *type*, for the setting up of a folio page in double columns. But the matrices or other tools, which he had used for the *Donatus*, would have enabled him to cast or prepare this larger quantity of type at once, without borrowing more than a few guilders.

What *tools*, then, did Gutenberg want to prepare with Fust's money? I leave Dr. Van der Linde to answer this question. To me it seems clear that when Gutenberg contracted, in 1449 or 1450, with Fust for money for the purpose of "preparing tools," he had an "idea" of printing, but had not yet *printed* anything; for if he had, he would not have been under the necessity of making tools. And that he had not produced any "books" in 1452, seems to me also clear from his saying at the trial (line 42), that "he hoped he was under no obligation to Fust to devote the first eight hundred guilders to the work of the books." And that he had not produced any "books" in 1454,* after he had received a second eight hundred guilders, seems also pretty clear from the very fact that the lawsuit did take place, which Fust brought against Gutenberg, not to recover "books," but to recover money.

In the document, which comes next after that of the 1455 lawsuit, the colophon of the Psalter of 1457,† published by Fust and Schoeffer, the art of printing is plainly indicated and its importance fully realised; for it is said that the Codex was "*venustate capitalium decoratus, rubricationibusque sufficienter distinctus, adinventionem artificiosa imprimendi ac caracterizandi absque ulla calami exaratione sic effigiatus,*" but not a word is said of an *inventor*, nor of the *place* where it was invented. On the other hand, the colophon speaks,

* As Dr. Van der Linde, by a calculation to which I do not object, makes the transaction between Gutenberg and Fust *begin* in 1449 (that is to say, a year earlier than was hitherto supposed), it stands to reason that, by the same calculation, we must make it come to an end a year earlier, so that the date 6 Nov., 1455, of the Notarial instrument, would be simply that of the long protracted decision in a lawsuit which commenced in 1454.

† An *earlier* document would be the *Donatus* published by Schoeffer with the colophon, "*arte nova imprimendi seu caracterizandi per Petrum de Gernsheym in urbe Moguntina cum suis capitalibus absque calami exaratione effigiatus,*" for it may be presumed to have been issued about, or before, 1456. But it has no date, and can, therefore, not be placed in a strictly chronological sequence.

not of an "inventio," but of an "adinventio," which may be taken to mean that the "invention" itself had already been made; but that now something *additional*, some "new mode" of printing, had been effected. The same colophon is repeated by the same printers in 1459 twice (Psalter and Durandus), in 1460 (Clementinae), in 1462 (Bible), and in several later publications. In 1465 we find a variation introduced and used in some books: "non atramento [communis, added in 1468] plumali canna neque aerea, sed artificiosa quadam adinventione imprimendi seu caracterizandi [or, after *seal*, simply: arte quadam perpulera]"; but, whatever variation is made, and however much the printers may endeavour to make the nature of their art clear and understood, there never is one word about an inventor or a place of invention.

In 1460 there comes a new testimony, namely, the colophon of the Catholicon, in which the new mode of printing is still more fully indicated, and its importance still more fully realised, for it says that the book in 1460

"Impressus atque confectus est alma in urbe maguntina nationis inclite Germanice. Quam [the German nation] dei clemencia tam alto ingenij lumine donoque gratuito ceteris terrarum nacionibus preferre illustrareque dignatus [dignatus] est. Non calami, stili aut pennae suffragio sed mira patronarum formarumque concordia proporcione et modulo."

Here Gutenberg himself speaks according to the advocates of his claims. He had been robbed and wronged in 1455 by his former partner Fust, in conjunction with Peter Schoeffer. He had, it is alleged, succeeded in obtaining fresh money from a certain Dr. Homery, a Syndic of Mentz, to establish a new printing office, and now, in 1460—after he had seen his two cruel rivals publish book after book with colophons loudly proclaiming the importance of the new art "invented and perfected," it is said, by himself—he (Gutenberg) issues a grand product of his own, with a long-winded and verbose colophon about the new mode of printing and the blessed German nation, without mentioning his own name or his "invention" with one single word. Nay, even the word *adinventio*, found in Fust and Schoeffer's imprints, is altogether omitted here. Dr. Van der Linde and others have considered it necessary to explain this silence, this extraordinary silence, which indeed has struck everybody. This silence was necessary, it is argued, otherwise Gutenberg's creditors would have seized the copies and his printing-office into the bargain. This explanation is, indeed, as extraordinary as Gutenberg's silence itself. It may be supposed that the publication of such a book as the Catholicon—a large folio volume of nearly four hundred leaves—would excite attention even at the present time, among the ocean of large and small publications that are daily issued. But in 1460 such works did not appear every hour of the day. And as the colophon says distinctly, that it was printed and perfected at *Mentz* (the very city where Gutenberg's chief creditor resided), in the year 1460, by an art which is described with most remarkable details, I do not see how its printer could possibly have expected to escape being found out. Fust and Schoeffer, who printed in that very same city of Mentz, at the very same time, could hardly have lost sight, since 1455, of their former interesting, but impeccunious, colleague. They must have known it, if there had been another printing-office established at Mentz besides their own, as printers were far from

numerous at the time; only one other at Strassburg, leaving the Haarlem office out of the question. They must have known, moreover, who was the owner of that third office. But even if they did not know, the appearance, under their very eyes, of such a work printed on vellum and on paper, and provided with a colophon in which every detail connected with the book, except the printer's name, is trumpeted about with great minuteness, could not have escaped their attention. And it is incredible that Fust and Schoeffer, or any other person, if Gutenberg owed them any money, would have been so guileless as to leave him alone, simply because he did not publish his name in the colophon.

Therefore, we shall have to look for another, a more satisfactory explanation of this silence on the part of Gutenberg, while his rivals were proclaiming aloud that they produced books by some "by-invention," and even copied afterwards expressions from his own colophon. I think if we examine further documents we shall find that explanation. In 1465 (17 January), eleven years after printing had been going on at Mentz, the Archbishop of Mentz issues a decree whereby he rewards Gutenberg for "his services"; but not a word is said about his "invention," nay, not even of his career as a "printer." On February 26, 1468, Dr. Homery (the man who had helped Gutenberg, it is said, to a new printing office) writes a letter of obligation to the same Archbishop of Mentz, acknowledging to have received from the archbishop "several forms, letters, instruments, implements and other things belonging to the work of printing, which Johan Gutenberg had left after his death, and which had and still belonged to him [Dr. Homery], and undertaking to use them, but in no other town than Mentz, nor to sell them to any person but a citizen of Mentz, even if a stranger should offer him a higher price for the things." Here, indeed, we see that Gutenberg had been in possession of things "belonging to the work of printing," but there is, again, nothing about him as an "inventor."

At last, in this same year, 1468—therefore, fully *fourteen* years after printing had made its public appearance at Mentz, and at a time when its existence there and its character had already been advertised and explained, during a period of fully eleven years, before the eyes of the whole world, in the most public manner and in the most precise terms, but always without any, even the slightest hint as to its being invented at Mentz or anywhere else in Germany—we enter on a somewhat new phase in the history of the invention. Namely, in that year we have, or think that we hear, something resembling an *allusion*, made at Mentz itself, regarding a Mentz origin of the *type*. That is to say, in the fifth distich of the colophon of the *Grammatica*, published by Peter Schoeffer, we read: "At *moguntina* sum fusus in *urbe* libellus / Meque *domus* genuit *unde* *caragma* venit." The whole colophon, which contains also the date, is written, not in the sober prose of the earlier Fust and Schoeffer colophons of 1457 to 1468, but in six distichs.

Now, the second line of the fifth distich literally says: "the house whence the *caragma* (*type*) comes has begotten (or produced) me (*i.e.*, the book)." Does this mean "the house *where the type is* *"

* *Venit* is short (*vēnit*, present tense, not *vēnit*, perfect) and can only mean "comes" not "came."

invented? In former years the verse was usually understood to have this meaning. M. Madden (*Lettres d'un bibliographe*, III^e serie, p. 94) translated in 1874, "C'est Mayence qui me voit renaitre (*sic*) et sortir de la maison de l'inventeur de l'imprimerie." Dr. Van der Linde (*Geschichte*, p. 48) translates in 1886, "from the house whence typography has gone forth." I myself did not think of any better translation in 1882, as may be seen in my *Gutenberg*, p. 190. But suppose the line could have such a meaning, then we should have here a wrong statement, because *the house* which produced the book (=where the book was printed) was undoubtedly that of Peter Schoeffer, and we know that Gutenberg never occupied that house and that, consequently, the type was not invented there. *Domus* has also been taken in a general sense as meaning "the home (*i.e.*, Mentz)," in which case the second line would be expletive and stand in apposition to the first, meaning "the home (*i.e.*, Mentz), where the type was invented, produced me."

But in recent years we have learned something from M. Madden (the same bibliographer who has given us the *free* translation of the distich quoted above), that we did not know before, or overlooked when we ventured on the above interpretations. Namely, the *Grammatica* was written by John Fons, or Brunnen, who was Peter Schoeffer's press-corrector. Now, it is not unreasonable, I think, to assume that Schoeffer's press-corrector lived in his house, and if the author of the book did live in Schoeffer's house, he must have written the *Grammatica* there. Hence we may translate the two lines quoted above: "Forsooth, I am a little book cast (a reference to the casting of the type) in the Mentz city / And I was *written* (produced or begotten) in the (very same) *house* whence the type comes (*i.e.*, where I am printed)." By this interpretation the supposed allusion to an *invention* of type falls to the ground. But I believe it will commend itself better than all other interpretations.

Lest there should remain any doubt on the point, I will quote the six distichs of the colophon entire:—

Quis	{ Codiculum qui me fundis fons es rationum { Cannam qui fontis fons bone nosse velis.
Quid	{ Si non de concha sed fonte est nomen et omen { Me fontis mactam tingite gramaticam.
Cui	{ Atque maturino tibi dedicor inclite magni { Nunc logothecarum patris in arce comes.
Cur	{ Me fieri cogunt redeuntia famina ioseph { Conche fors leua seuaque fata simul.
Vbi	{ At moguntina sum fusus in vrbe libellus { Meque domus genuit vnde caragma venit.
Quando	{ Terseno sed in anno terdeni iubilei. { Mundi post columen qui es benedictus Amen.

It will be seen that the words prefixed to each distich are meant to summarise their contents: *Quis*, who wrote the book; *Quid*, what it is; *Cui*, to whom it is dedicated; *Cur*, why it was written; *Vbi*, where it was written and printed; *Quando*, when it was written and printed. It will be clear, I think, that *Vbi* of the fifth distich does not and could not comprehend the important statement that printing was invented in

that particular house. And it will also be clear, I think, that if John Fons had intended to state that *typography* had been *invented in the house of his master* or anywhere else in *Mentz*, his poetical talent would have been quite equal to the occasion, and would have supplied him with another distich, to convey this important information in the same precise and unambiguous terms in which he stated his six other points.

In the same year 1468, on May 24, the same Peter Schoeffer published an edition of the *Justinianus*, in which, besides the ordinary colophon which he used from 1457 to 1468, we find also some verses written by Joh. Brunnen mentioned above, in which two "Johannes" are spoken of as "Librorum insignes *prothocaragmatici* quos genuit ambos urbs maguntina." This is said to mean "the distinguished *first*-printers of books both of whom the Mentz city begot," or, in other words, "the two first-printers of books were born at Mentz." But at the time that these verses were written the prefix *protho-* (or *proto*) usually meant *first* (in point of rank or dignity), *chief* (princeps), the same as *Archi-*; e. g.: *proto-notarius*, *proto-apostolarius*; *proto-vestiarius*; *proto-cancellarius*, &c., &c. (see Du Cange), but seldom, if ever, *first*, in point of time. So, for instance, Christopher Plantin, the celebrated printer of Antwerp, was called Prototypographer of the King; but no one would say that he was the *first*-printer of the King. But suppose we take *prothocaragmatici* as meaning: "first-printers," even then "quos genuit ambos urbs maguntina" may mean "both of whom the Mentz city produced," that is to say, it does not necessarily mean that they were *born* at Mentz, but Mentz produced them, not as human beings, but as *printers*; they began their career there as printers. By this interpretation John Gutenberg and John Fust (suppose they are the two Johannes referred to, which has not yet been proved) would appear as the first printers of Mentz, but the verses would lose all their importance with regard to the tradition of an invention of printing. It is, I think, necessary to look at these verses in the *Justinianus* from as many points of view as we possibly can, for they are written by a person who was not an actor in the first period of the art at Mentz; they appear, moreover, fourteen, or rather eighteen years after the invention of printing must have been accomplished at Mentz, if it was made there at all, and after a deep and profound silence of as many years, not on the art of printing, but on its invention and its author. And though I do not think that, on the poetical and highly-coloured phrases in the *Justinianus*, we could possibly base a claim to the honour of an invention of printing at Mentz, still, if they bear the meaning which is usually given to them, they would at least mark the *starting-point* of the tradition of a Mentz invention.

But in whatever way we may feel inclined to interpret the two lines in the *Justinianus* of 1468, the long spell of silence about an "invention" of printing in Germany is at last broken, in this same year, 1468. But it is not broken by Germany, nor by Mentz, nor by Schoeffer, nor by any other German printer, but by *Italy*, by an Italian bishop. I allude to Johannes Andreas, Bishop of Aleria, who says in the dedication of his edition of St. Jerome's Epistles, published in that year (on 13th December) at Rome, to Pope Paul II. (1464-1471), that "Germany is to be honoured of all generations as the inventress of the greatest utilities. The glorious mind of Cardinal Nicolas of Cusa [who died 11th August,

1464], greatly desired that this sacred art [of printing], which then appeared to arise in Germany, should be brought to Rome.”*

The preface is not dated. The colophon has : “Eusebii Hieronymi doctoris eximii secundum epistolarum explicit uolumen. anno christi. M.CCCC. LXVIII. Indictione prima. die uero. XIII. mensis decembris. Pontifice maximo Paulo regnante secundo. anno eius quinto. Rome in domo magnifici uiri Petri de Maximo.” This preface is reprinted in the edition of 1470 by the same printers.

But this Italian testimony is silent about Mentz and about an “inventor.” It does not even speak with any remarkable certainty of the invention having been made in Germany. And as Sweynheym and Pannarts, the two first printers of Italy (who are supposed to have inspired this testimony), were Germans who may be, or are presumed to have learnt their art at Mentz, under the very eyes and presence of the so-called inventor, it looks as if this Italian testimony, as regards this *German* invention, is simply derived from the colophons of the Mentz books, without the bishop and his informants knowing anything, or feeling justified in saying anything, of an “inventor,” or of the place where the invention had been made. In fact it speaks of Sweynheym and Pannarts as the “authors” of printing types.

At last, in 1472, this long spell of silence about the “inventor” is broken ; but, again, not by Mentz, not by Germany, not by any German printer, but by *France*. I allude to the letter of Gul. Fichet

* Dabis ueniam pater beatissime ... et promptam uoluntatem pro maiori munere computabis : cum uideris me digniora uoluisse. Trado enim tibi quicquid habeo : & duo minuta in gazophylacium mitto ... Tuis certe temporibus ad reliquas dei gratias : hoc etiam felicitatis orbi christiano munus accessit : ut pauperrimi quique parua pecunia bibliothecas possint redimere. An parua est hec tue sanctitatis gloria : ut que uolumina uix centum aureis emi poterant aliis temporibus : uiginti hodie ac minoris bene exarata : et non mendocissime facta redimantur ? que uix uiginti aureis lecturi mercabantur : quatuor et uilius etiam nunc emantur ? Adde quod quicquid ingeniorum olim fuit : latebatque pene in puluere et tineis propter immensos labores : ac nimia describentium precia : sub tuo principatu ceptum est scaturire : et per omnem orbem uberrimo fonte diffluere. Eiusmodi est enim *impressorum nostrorum* : et *characteres effingentium artificium* : ut uix inter hominum inuenta : non modo noua : sed ne uetera quidem quicquam excellentioris inuenti possit referri. *Digne honoranda seculisque omnibus magnificienda profecto germania* est : utilitatum inuentrix maximarum. Hoc est quod semper gloriosa illa : et celo digna *anima Nicolai cuscensis* [died 11 Aug., 1464] *cardinalis Sancti Petri ad uincula peroptabat* : ut hec saneta ars que oriri tunc uidebatur in germania : romam deduceretur. Iam uota illius qui te beatissime pater : ut pupillam oculi sui dilexit : coluit : admiratus est : credo ipso ad genua domini nostri Jesu Christi hec efflagitante : tuo tempore impleta sunt. Tuus pontificatus : ceteris ex partibus gloriosissimus : hac arte ad tuos sanctos pedes aduecta obliuionem in hominum memoria nunquam accipiet : nisi si quando esse desinet mentio litterarum ... Verum hoc quoque magnum est pater beatissime ... quod tuo tempore non minus ualet pene papyrus uacua et nuda pergamene : quam odie [= hodie] *optatissimi libri emantur* ... Ego posteris in his scriptis constanter : semper admirationi futurum : trado : *prestantissimos characterum imprimendorum autores* : sub Pauli Secundi ueneti pontificatu *rome artem exercuisse cepisse tanto artificio* : et industria hominum : gratia nobis hac celitus per diuinum pastorem importata : ut minoris libri emi ferre possint : quam alias soleret redimi ligatura. Nunc igitur sume pontificum mansuetissime ... Sancti Hieronymi primum uolumen : habiturus deinceps : statutis temporibus : semper noua tue felicitatis indicia : quasi frugum te dignissimarum primicias : et *fove artis huius utilissime sub tua protectione Conradum : et Arnoldum germanos homines : arte imprimendi prestantes aduectores*.

to Rob. Gaguin, which was discovered at Basel, by Dr. Sieber, the librarian of the Basel University, in a copy of *Gasparini Orthographia*, printed at Paris circa 1472, in which Fichet speaks of "Johannes Bonemontanus" as the inventor of printing. This testimony has attracted a good deal of attention during the last two or three years. Some people have gone so far as to say that this early testimony finally settles the dispute in favour of Gutenberg. Dr. Van der Linde prints it with a shout of triumph. But, as the letter was apparently written and printed in 1472,* it comes only two years before the publication of the Chronicle of Philippus de Lignamine (Rome, 1474), which speaks of Gutenberg as printing in 1459, but not as the inventor of printing. And as this latter testimony has never been considered conclusive, it is hard to see how a difference of two years could make the Gutenberg tradition more weighty. Fichet, moreover, tells us that his story is a rumour current in Germany ("ferunt enim illic").

But Fichet's letter, though it is useless to those who wish to regard Gutenberg as the inventor of printing, is of considerable importance to those who, like myself, feel forced to deny that he was the inventor. For, instead of affirming, at this hour of the day, his claims as the inventor, it only helps us to demonstrate the hollowness of the whole Gutenberg tradition. Let me explain. It is, perhaps, not unreasonable to say, in fact everybody admits, that Fichet must have heard the rumour about Gutenberg from the first three Paris printers, who settled there about 1470. Two of them are known to have resided at Basel, and most likely learned their craft there, before they settled at Paris. We may, therefore, trace at once Fichet's "rumour" about Gutenberg to Berthold von Hanau, who was printing at Basel in 1468, and who is presumed to be the "Bertolff von Hanauwe," who appears in the Mentz lawsuit of 1455 as Gutenberg's servant. Therefore, Gutenberg's own servant speaks of his being "the inventor" by way of rumour only. To this chain we may link on the facts told us by Dr. Van der Linde (*Gesch. der Erfindung*, iii. 895, on the authority of the *Liber fraternitatis*): (1) that Gutenberg was a lay member of the ecclesiastical fraternity established in the collegiate church of St. Victor, near Mentz; (2) that of this church Gutenberg's relative, Ivo Wittig, who in 1504 erected a memorial stone to him, was a canon and the custodian of its seal. These two facts we may link on, in their turn, to the fact that this same relative of Gutenberg, Ivo Wittig, wrote, or at least is presumed to have written, the dedication to the Emperor Maximilian of the German translation of the Livy, published in 1505, by Johan Schoeffer (the son of Peter Schoeffer, and grandson of Johan Fust), in which the honour of the invention is ascribed to Johan Gutenberg, whereas the printer of the work, Johan Schoeffer, when he is left to himself, and is not under the influence of Ivo Wittig, Gutenberg's relative, invariably inscribes that honour to his father (Peter Schoeffer), or to his grandfather (Johan Fust). And when we further remember (1) that the two Heidelberg professors (Adam Wernher and Joh. Herbst), who wrote epigrams in 1494,† in honour of Johan

* Not 1470, as some writers say.

† These epigrams were never published at the time, but in this century, by F. J. Mone, *Quellensammlung der bad. Landesgesch.*, III. 163, from the MS. of Adam Wernher, preserved in the Archives of Carlsruhe.

Gensfleisch (=Ansicarus), and Jacobus Wimpheling, who, when residing at Heidelberg, wrote an epigram (on leaf 22^a of an *Oratio in memoriam Marsilii ab Inghen*, published at Mentz, in 1499, by P. Friedberg) in praise of the same "Ansicarus," were, to all appearances, inspired by Adam Gelthus, another relative of Gutenberg, who also resided at Heidelberg, and himself added a Latin epitaph on Joh. Gensfleisch "artis impressoriæ inventor," and "repertor," to Wimpheling's epigram: (2) that Franz Behcm was established in the collegiate church of St. Victor (mentioned above), as a printer, and in 1541, printed in that place the well-known poem ("de Chalcographiæ inventione") of his press reader, Arnold Bergclanus, in which the invention is ascribed to Gutenberg—we cannot fail to see that the assertion, that Gutenberg was the inventor of printing, was made and propagated, in an off-hand and unofficial way, by no other persons than those who either were related to him, or had been in his service, or connected with the St. Victor Church near Mentz.

Hence, we may say, perhaps without the possibility of a doubt, that the tradition of Gutenberg being the inventor of printing originated from no other person but Gutenberg himself. No doubt, during the hours which he spent among his convivial fellow-members of the St. Victor fraternity, he indulged in some talk about his "invention," or about his new mode of printing, perhaps in order to obtain a fresh loan, for he was always either quarrelling or borrowing money; or, perhaps, in order to account for the total disappearance of the 1,600 guilders lent him by Johan Fust, without his having published any books. But, however loquacious he and his friends may have been within the safe precincts of the monastery, they have, apparently, been very careful not to say anything about their "invention" in public, at the time that such an assertion could have been contradicted or affirmed, for there is, as we have seen, a deadly silence at Mentz and in Germany from 1454 till 1468.* His servant Berthold seems to have spoken of it (about 1468–1470?) at Basel as a rumour;† the two earliest German printers of Subiaco and Rome seem to have known nothing of Gutenberg, perhaps not even of an "invention"; the Archbishop of Mentz seems to know nothing about an "invention," he does not even seem to know that Gutenberg had been a printer. And Dr. Homery—one of the founders of a merry, gastronomical fraternity at Mentz (Van der Linde, p. 897), therefore, one not likely to be silent if he knew anything about it—is silent on the point, though he had to speak of Gutenberg in connexion with almost

* This silence at Mentz is actually not broken till 23 May, 1476, when Peter Schoeffer issued the third edition of *Justinianus* (Institutiones), in which he omitted the verses of 1468 (repeated in the *Justinianus* of 1472, and in the *Decretals* of 1473), which spoke of the two Johannes, the prothocaragmatici of Mentz, but said that Mentz is the "impressoriæ artis inventrix elimatrixque prima."

† It deserves to be noticed (a) that the collegiate Church of St. Victor, of which Gutenberg was a lay member, and his relative, Ivo Wittig, a Canon, and Keeper of the Seals, was situated near Mentz; and (b) that Fichet speaks of "Johannes Bonemontanus" as inventing printing, not at, but near, Mentz: "Ferunt enim illic, haut procul a civitate Maguncia, Joannem quendam fuisse, cui cognomen bonemontano, qui primus omnium impressoriam artem excogitaverit." Would it be, after all, possible that even Fichet's rumour has to be traced to the St. Victor Church? In such a case the extent of the rumour would be considerably narrowed, and certainly not to the benefit of Gutenberg's claims.

everything (!) "that belonged to printing"! Surely, such testimonics regarding a "*German invention*" of printing, and Gutenberg being the inventor of it, as we have explained above, would be instantly rejected if they came before a court of justice and were confronted, on the one hand with the profound silence at Mentz and in Germany from 1454 to 1476, and on the other hand with what has been said in favour of another party.

CHAPTER XVIII.

SUMMARY.

AFTER having explained what I desire to say for the present on the invention of printing, I will endeavour to sum up the results, so far as I am at liberty to call them results, in somewhat modified form. While proceeding, I will concentrate into a few words most of the arguments which I have ventured to advance at greater length before, always quoting in brackets (chaps. i., ii., &c., as the case may be) the number of the chapter or chapters where my views may be found. In this way I shall be able to state a few points more clearly than I was able to do when I had to surround them with all sorts of explanations.

Let us suppose that circumstances lead us to study the books printed before 1500, not in a haphazard fashion, but thoroughly, and animated with a sincere desire to know all about them. We start with the idea of making catalogues of such incunabula as will come under our observation from time to time, not only by visiting European libraries and private collections, but by studying and examining the fac-similes and catalogues of early printed books published by bibliographers. We arrange and describe the books, not alphabetically, but under their respective countries, towns, and printers, as the only method by which we can learn ourselves and be instructive to others.

After having studied, described, and arranged a large number of incunabula, we have gradually separated from all other books a group of forty-seven different works (chap. vii.), some of which we only know from fragments, and which we cannot ascribe to any other country but Holland, first, because certain peculiarities of their types (chaps. vii., xiv.) are known to be indicative of a Dutch, rather than of a German or Italian, or any other nationality (chap. xiv.), and, secondly, because one of the works (the *Spiegel*), printed in the same types as a good many of the others, is written in the Dutch language (chaps. vii., xi.). As none of them bear a date, place of printing, or printer's name, we cannot assign them forthwith to any particular town of Holland, nor to any printer, nor to any definite year or period.

Our books are printed in eight different (Gothic) types* (chap. vii.), of which i. and ii. belong together, because they are found in one and the same book; iii., iv., v. and vi. also belong together, but we cannot as yet prove that these are inseparably connected with i. and ii.,

* Fac-similes of them all are found in Holtrop's *Monuments typogr. des Pays-Bas*.

though the family-likeness between them is so striking that we could not separate them without further evidence; and vii. and viii. we link on to the types i.-vi., for the same reason that we link the latter types together.

As regards the date to be assigned to the books, when we take them up one after the other, without comparing them together, or with any of the other incunabula, we feel, at first sight, inclined to assign some of them provisionally to the rather conventional date 1470, and some to the rather conventional dates *circa* 1472 or 1473. But it strikes us that we cannot place any one of them *later* than the year 1474, as they are all, not one excepted, without signatures, without initial directors, without hyphens, without catchwords; in short, without any of those characteristics which we see gradually, one after the other, come into almost general use from 1473 (if not earlier) to 1480. We even find (chap. x., xi.) that four editions of one and the same book (the *Speculum*) are wholly printed on one side (anopisthographic) only, partly as a blockbook, and partly with movable metal types, which is a unique feature in the whole annals of printing, and certainly not easily explainable after 1470. And as regards the lines—the even or unevenness of which is, in many cases, a sure guide in the dating of books—we find that in some of our works in types iv., v., vii., they show a tendency to be even (though not always), whereas in the others they are uneven. So that, if we sub-divide the books into groups, according to their types and workmanship, the books in types iv., v., vii., show a certain advance over those in types i., ii., iii., vi., viii., which compels us to put the latter group in an *earlier* period than the former.

Examining further, we notice that 4 of the books in types iv. and v. (the later group) must have been printed after 1458, as they bear the name of Pope Pius II. (chap. xii.). On the other hand, type v. must have existed before September 13, 1474, as a copy of one of the books in that type was bought by an abbat who was abbat only from (the end of) 1471 till September 13, 1474 (chap. xii.). We observe, moreover, that one of the works in type v. commences on the verso of the last leaf of another book (*Ludovicus Pontanus*) in type iv. (chap. vii.), which not only connects these two types, but seems to prove (1) that type iv. existed before v. was used (before September 13, 1474); (2) that, when it was used in this connexion, it was on the point of being discarded. That we have correctly placed type i. earlier than iv. and v., is clear from the fact that fragments of a *Donatus* printed in type i. are used, towards the end of 1473, as binder's waste, in the binding of a Haarlem register or account-book for 1474 (chap. viii.)—a fact which naturally suggests a much earlier existence of that type than 1473.

Well, then, seeing that, on bibliographical grounds, we cannot place any of the books later than 1474 (or, if any, only a few in types v. and vii.), and that certain circumstances suggest an earlier existence of, at least, two of the types (i. and iv.), we are at once confronted with the fact that we have to deal, not with forty-seven different works, but only with *twelve* different works, and that our number of forty-seven books, or volumes, consists of several *different editions* of four or five of these works. For instance, we have four editions of the *Speculum*, twenty editions of the *Donatus*, eight of the *Doctrinale*, &c. (chap. vii.). Now, if our group or groups of books consisted of forty-seven different works,

we might suppose them to have been set up the one immediately after the other, so that an active printer might have issued them all in two or three, or four years, as the books are not voluminous. But *editions* of one and the same work, totally *different* (not in text, but in the setting up), suggest intervals between each successive edition; intervals of *waiting* till the copies of the previous edition are sold. We have *twenty* (!) editions of the *Donatus*. How long an interval shall we place between each of them? Half a year? We then get ten years for the successive issue of our twenty editions, that is to say, a period from about 1464 to 1474. Even such a period (based on a too modest calculation) would entirely alter the history of the *introduction* of printing into the Netherlands, as it is propounded to us by the opponents of the Haarlem claims. But an interval of half a year between each edition seems rather short for that period. The *Donatus* was, indeed, a popular school book, and may, therefore, be considered to have been much in demand; but, on the other hand, the students of the Latin language could not have been numerous, and, no doubt, a good many manuscript copies were still being prepared by the side of the printed copies. So, for instance, the three hundred copies of the *Donatus*, which Sweynheym and Pannarts printed at Subiaco, though they all appear to have been used up, seem to have been quite sufficient for the printers' purpose, as we do not find that they printed any more. Of the *Donatus* in the thirty-six line Bible type, attributed to Gutenberg, three editions seem to have been sufficient. Of the Schoeffer *Donatuses* we know no more than four editions. Would it, then, be unreasonable to suppose that our Dutch printer printed a small number of copies of his first and second, but gradually more of his later editions, and that, in this way, we might, on an average, allow an interval of about eighteen months between each edition? This would give us about thirty years for the successive issue of the nineteen editions, that is from *circa* 1445 to 1474.

It is, of course, possible to argue that, although types i. and ii. belong together, and also types iii., iv., v. and vi., it is as yet not proved that those two groups of types were both used in the same office, and that a similar objection may be made as regards types vii. and viii., between neither of which any connexion, except that of a family-likeness, has ever been established. So that, if we split up the one group of eight types into four groups, and suppose that each group belonged to a different printer, the twenty editions of the *Donatus* might all be supposed to have been printed in the space of a few years. It might even be supposed that the founders of the different types transferred some of their stock to other persons to enable them to print *Donatuses*. This last supposition may be met at once by the fact that the earliest printers only manufactured a small quantity of type, and that there is no trace anywhere, so far as we know, of the existence, at such an early period, of any large stock of type from which portions could be transferred. Nor do we hear of such transfers before about 1480, except the two supposed transfers of Gutenberg to Pfister and Bechtermünzce; and these are both so doubtful, that we had better build no speculations upon them. And, as regards disconnecting types i. and ii. from iii., iv., v., and vi., and the latter in their turn from vii. and viii., and the latter again from each other, it is possible. It would even be quite in accordance with what I have said myself in my work *Gutenberg: Was he the Inventor of Printing?* (p. 166)

namely, that "in dealing with anonymously printed books we must arrange them according to their type, and if two books are printed in different types, and we have no evidence to show that they are printed by one and the same printer, it becomes necessary to ascribe them to different printers." But when I said this I was specially referring to the types of the thirty-line and thirty-one line Indulgences of 1454, between which there is no such family-likeness as we observe in those of the Costeriana. This likeness and similarity is so great that Mr. Holtrop at one time actually thought that types ii. and iii. were identical, in which case types i. to vi. would actually be inseparable; but later on (in his *Monuments*, p. 29) he considered them to be different. And Mr. Bradshaw found this likeness so striking that he, too, was of opinion that the eight types should be kept together. But even if we assume four different printers instead of one, we should still retain six editions of the *Donatus* in type i., and of one of them fragments were used as binder's waste at the end of 1473, while in type v. (which was in existence before September 13, 1474) we have also six editions of the same work, while there are four editions in type iv., which must be assumed to have existed and perhaps to have been used up before type v. began to be employed. So that the net result of all these speculations would be the establishment of at least four new early printers in the Netherlands, all working a considerable time before 1474, and none of them leaving a trace of their existence behind. Such a supposition is possible of one, perhaps of two, but hardly of four or more printers. So that after all it seems better to keep the eight types together and see how the dates 1446 to 1474 will work.

At this point we think it useful to compare our forty-seven incunabula with some of the earliest books printed in the Low Countries, at Utrecht, Louvain, &c. (circa 1473-1480), and we find that the latter have nothing in common with them, either in workmanship or in type, but, on the other hand, the types of our forty-seven books remind us, in every respect, of the earlier period of the Dutch blockbooks and manuscripts (chap. xiv.).

We also find that they are all, so far as we know, without any *colophon*, which would be incompatible with a period after 1471, but not with the earlier period of the blockbooks and MSS. (chap. xiv.).

We see, moreover, that out of the forty-seven books, no less than thirty-five are printed on *vellum*, which is incompatible with a period after 1471, but not with the earlier period of the blockbooks and MSS. (chap. xiv.). It is true we hesitate for a moment to turn this vellum printing into evidence for an early period, because we observe that nearly all the later editions of the *Donatus* are likewise printed on vellum, even so late as 1500, and perhaps later, so that it looks as if there existed an idea of having this and similar schoolbooks printed on stronger material than paper. This idea, however, seems to have already existed before or about 1456, as the six or seven early Mentz *Donatuses* that we know of are also printed on vellum. But, of course, the idea, if it did exist before or about 1456, may just as well be supposed to have entered the mind of another, of a still earlier printer, who commenced, perhaps, in 1445 and left off in 1474. In such a case we may assume, not only that this earlier printer commenced to print on vellum, because he was more accustomed to it than to paper, but that he continued to print on it by way of custom or tradition, and that

other printers caught the habit or custom from him, or from seeing his products. But if we place this printer with all his vellum *Donatuses*, *Doctrinales*, and other products, say, in the quincentennium 1470–1475, there would evidently be a break in the vellum printing from 1456 to 1470, as during that period printing on *paper* was *universal* wherever printing had been introduced, and even *Donatuses* began to appear printed on paper. And what is still more remarkable, there would actually be an almost complete break in the *production* of these schoolbooks from 1456 to 1470. For, whereas, from about 1450 (?) till about 1456 we see at least seven editions of the *Donatus* appear at Mentz, there are very few editions of that schoolbook which we could place between 1456 and 1470, if we assigned all the Dutch *Donatuses* to the years 1471–1474. On the other hand, if we place the Dutch editions in the latter period, we should witness, from 1471 to 1474, a perfect inundation of *Donatuses* and *Doctrinales*. So that, after all, this almost exclusive vellum printing of schoolbooks seems more compatible with a gradual production during a reasonable period before 1474, than with a hurried and overloaded production between 1471 and 1474.

Nor do we find anything in the woodcuts of the *Speculum* inconsistent with the early period in which these books must be placed on account of the anopisthographic mode of their printing (chap. x., xi., xiv.).

Finally, we compare our forty-seven Dutch with some early German incunabula, by preference the earliest of Mentz, to ascertain whether the workmanship in the two groups of books forbids us to place the former in the same or in an earlier period than the German books. But we can see no reason (chap. xii.) why, for instance, the *Laurentius Valla*, in type iii., should not be placed in point of time by the side of the *Catholicon* of 1460, or why the four editions of the *Speculum* should not be placed a few years earlier than 1454–1460 (the sexennium of the Mentz Indulgences of 1454, the Psalters of 1457 and 1459 and the *Catholicon* of 1460); nor why some of the Dutch *Donatuses* should not be placed a few years earlier than the Gutenberg and Schoeffer *Donatuses*. For, not only have we learned that from at least 1454, when the first *printed* date makes its appearance, till about 1477, all printers followed one universal plan of printing, that is, they simply imitated the MSS. of their time, so that there is scarcely any difference in the mode of printing books, and, therefore, hardly any difference in their look (chap. vi.); but we have seen that through this unaltered, and therefore uncertain and deceptive look, books have often been placed fifty, forty, thirty, twenty, or ten years backwards or forwards, in accordance with fresh evidence or new opinions (chap. vi., ix.).

Having now examined and weighed, as bibliographers, all the internal and external features of our Dutch incunabula, and every positive and negative argument that we can advance ourselves, or find advanced by others, for or against the period 1446 to 1474, and finding nothing against, but everything in favour of it, we turn to history in order to ascertain what has been said about the invention of printing. Here we are at once reminded (1) of the testimony in the *Cologne Chronicle* of 1499 (=Ulrich Zell) which declares, not only that the *Donatuses* printed in *Holland* were printed before there was any printing at Mentz, where it did not commence till 1450, but also that these *Donatuses* served as *models* (the *first prefiguration, the beginning*) for the printing at Mentz (chap. xiii., xv.)—a testimony which is all the stronger

because it is evidently a contradiction of the tradition or rumour that Gutenberg invented printing at Mentz. (2) Of the passage in the *Batavia* of Hadrianus Junius, claiming, very circumstantially, and independently of the *Cologne Chronicle*, the honour of the invention of printing for Laurens Janszoon Coster, of Haarlem (chap. ii., xiii., xv., xvi.), and basing this claim not merely upon the tradition which lived in Junius's time (1568) among the inhabitants of the town, but upon the *Speculum* (the four editions of which we could not possibly place in the decennium 1470-1480) and the *Doctrinale*, both printed in the identical types which were employed for at least six of our earliest *Donatuses* which we may fit into Zell's account (chap. xv.). This account of Junius we find indirectly confirmed by the finding at Haarlem, five times over, and oftener, of fragments of our books (ch. viii.), and even several leaves and smaller fragments, which had been used as binder's waste by Cornelis, the bookbinder (*see* p. 27, No. 8), the very man whom Junius alleges to have been the servant of the inventor. We find it also indirectly confirmed by the similarity between the writing which we find in the Haarlem Registers of the period 1440 to 1446 (chap. xiv.). And though we cannot as yet accept Junius's year, 1440, as that in which the invention of printing was made, much less his year (1442) as that of the transference of printing to Mentz (through Coster's types), we must not pin an author of the sixteenth century strictly to all his dates, even if we were sure that the text of the *Batavia* were correct as it stands. But we find that we cannot be so sure of this point. On the contrary, the date of Junius's preface (1575) and the 128 years of his text suggest 1446 as the date of the invention, and 1442 in the text might be an error for 1452 (ch. xvi.). Knowing, however, that most of his genealogical and bibliographical particulars are correct, we are content to leave some doubtful points till we have a trustworthy account of all that bears on the subject. We are further reminded (3) of the assertions of Van Zuren and Coornhert, both living at Haarlem about 1561, and speaking publicly of the prevalence at Haarlem of the traditions of the Haarlem invention. (4) Of a pedigree, said to be of about 1520, of the reputed Haarlem inventor's family, on which it is asserted that "Coster brought the first print into the world in 1446" (chap. xvi.). (5) Of two MS. entries of an Abbat of Cambray that in 1446 (therefore, before there was admittedly any printing at Mentz) and 1451, he bought printed * copies of the *Doctrinale*, of which we have also eight editions (the interval between each being no doubt greater than that between the *Donatuses*, as it was neither such a small, nor such a popular, book) printed in Holland, three† of them printed in the identical types of the earliest *Donatuses* (which we may fit into Zell's account), and of the *Speculum* on which Junius bases his assertion.

* The term is, as we know, *gette en molle*, or *jettez en molle*, and the phrase is, as Bernard (*Origine* i. 97 sqq.) shows, by at least eight examples, applied from 1474 to 1593 to typographically printed books; while he adds that he could multiply his examples without end, the term being used in the north and south of France till the present time. It seems quite plain that the abbat is speaking of a new, not generally known, mode of manufacturing books. But in 1446 or 1451 neither manuscript books nor blockbooks were unknown or new; therefore, it seems natural to apply the abbat's term to the new mode of printing.

† If Junius is correct, one, at least, of these editions must have been printed at Mentz, but with the types stolen from Coster.

At this point we examine the claims of Gutenberg and of Mentz (chap. xvii.), and find that the assertion of an invention of printing there about 1450 is rather contradicted by the perfection in which the art makes its appearance there all at once in 1454. We see further that none of the testimonies which speak of such an invention at Mentz are earlier than 1468, that is to say, the tradition of an invention of printing, in Germany or at Mentz, does not spring into life till fourteen years after the greatest publicity had been given to the *existence* of the art of printing at Mentz. These testimonies, moreover, are mere pieces of gossip or rumours, all of which we can trace to Gutenberg himself (or to the St. Victor monastery, of which he was a lay-member), and to two of his relatives, and in no case are they based, like the Holland and Haarlem claims, on distinctly and especially named books. They come to us, in the first instance, not from Mentz, nor from Germany, but in an offhand and suspicious way from Italy and France, and only much later do we find definite statements made in Germany itself; whereas, on the other hand, Gutenberg himself and all those at Mentz or in its neighbourhood—who ought to have known, and ought to and would have spoken, if an invention had taken place there—preserve, during the first fourteen years of printing at Mentz, the strictest silence in public, and seem to know nothing about it, though some of those men (even Gutenberg himself) speak of the art of printing with consummate minuteness, and mention everything except the one thing needful, namely that the art of printing had been invented by Gutenberg or at Mentz. Under these circumstances we could hardly infer from this silence at Mentz and in Germany anything but that the invention was not made there.

Seeing then that there is absolutely no foundation for the claims of Gutenberg and Mentz to the honour of the invention, except such a one as would have to be rejected, even if we had never heard of any other claims, we turn again to the Dutch books. We make a last inquiry to see whether they might not, for some reason or another, be ascribed to another town of Holland than Haarlem, or to another printer. For we have during the last fifty* years heard of Utrecht (ch. viii.) as the place where they might have been printed. But the fact, that twice or three times fragments of *Costeriana* have lately been found there, is certainly out-weighed by the finding several times over of fragments at Haarlem. And the circumstance that the blocks of the *Speculum* were used, cut asunder, at Utrecht in 1481 and 1483, is hardly evidence for the printer of the *Speculum* having resided in that place. But if, for this reason, we were to place the printer there, we should have to re-arrange a good many other incunabula, among others those ascribed to Gutenberg, which would all have to be taken away from him (p. 35).

Therefore, finding that the testimonies—the independent testimonies—of the *Cologne Chronicle*, Junius, &c., point to the *Donatuses*, *Specula*, *Doctrinales*, which we have examined above, as the first books ever printed, and that these books in their turn bibliographically agree with the testimonies and the dates mentioned in them, and that no other town nor any other printer ever laid claim to these books—we have hardly any choice but to ascribe, till the contrary has been

* Wetter already suggested Utrecht as the place where the *Costeriana* might have been printed in his *Geschichte der Erfindung*.

proved, the honour of the invention of printing, with movable types, to Lourens Janszoon Coster, of Haarlem, fixing the date provisionally not later than 1446 (the end of 1445).

Suppose now that we, for one reason or another, assume that Gutenberg invented printing with movable types at Mentz, we should at once feel puzzled what books to ascribe to him, for none bear his name; and those that are usually attributed to him (as the thirty-one line Indulgence of 1454, the thirty-six line Bible, &c., and three or four *Donatuses*) we should, in grouping the German incunabula, place with those of Albrecht Pfister at Bamberg, who printed with these types in 1461 (chap. vi.). But on further consideration, seeing that the date (1454) of the Indulgence is rather early for Bamberg printing, and that the small brief type in the Indulgence was never used by Pfister, we feel inclined to think that perhaps Gutenberg may have printed the earliest works ascribed to him, and have afterwards transferred his type to Albrecht Pfister. And though this would be entirely against all that we see happen from 1454 till 1477 (chap. vi.), we assume its possibility, otherwise there would be no books at all that could be apportioned to Gutenberg, for the thirty-line Indulgence of 1454, and the forty-two line Bible (Mazarine Bible), must be put down to Peter Schoeffer,* while all the other books, as the *Catholicon* of 1460, &c., ascribed to Gutenberg, are too late to serve as a basis for a claim to the honour of the invention of printing.

Suppose, then, that the early Mentz books must be arranged as in my work on Gutenberg (p. 150 *sqq.*), we are again puzzled at the perfection in which printing appears at Mentz the moment that we hear of it (chap. xv.). Well, it is said, the experiments of the inventor may not have resulted in anything worth preserving, or, if they had any practical results, these may not have come down to us. Or it is said that the *Donatuses* known to be printed in the thirty-six line Bible type (chap. xii.; see also pp. 59 to 61) are Gutenberg's first-fruits.†

When these answers have removed to some extent our doubts, we are again at our wit's end how to explain the profound silence preserved, for at least fourteen years (1454–1468), by every one at Mentz and in Germany about an inventor, the invention itself, and the place of invention, though elaborate attempts were made during that very same period to proclaim loudly and publicly that some new mode of printing, some by-invention, had come into existence and was actually employed at Mentz to produce books. There is not, therefore, as we are so often told, any secrecy about the art of printing itself, but that it was invented at Mentz, and that a German invented it, is carefully concealed. And even Gutenberg himself preserves this inexplicable silence on two occasions (the lawsuit of 1455, and the *Catholicon* of 1460), when he,

* See my work: *Gutenberg: Was he the Inventor of Printing?* p. 164 *sqq.*

† It is rather dangerous to base Gutenberg's claim, as Dr. Van der Linde does (*Geschichte*, 813), on one or two *Donatuses* in the thirty-six line Bible type, and to place these about 1448–1450, and at the very same time to relegate another set of the same schoolbook printed in Holland, and showing decidedly the same primitive workmanship as the Mentz *Donatuses*, to the decennium 1470–1480. It is true, the *Donatus* fac-similed in Dr. Van der Linde's last book has, if possible, more uneven lines than any of the Dutch *Donatuses*; but every one must see that this merely arises from the larger and broader size of the types of the Mentz *Donatus*, and is not due to any greater degree of skill or incompetence on the part of the printer.

if he had been an inventor, ought to have spoken (chap. xvii.). Well, it is said, Gutenberg was robbed of all that he had made and done to put his new art into execution, and remained, moreover, heavily indebted to those who had so robbed him; so that his own interest forbade him to say anything not only in 1455, but when he published a large folio volume (in 1460), with all the details of the new art carefully described; for, if he had said anything his copies would at once have been seized, and his printing office too. We are told, moreover, that all those loud and public proclamations about the new art, omitting all details about the inventor, &c., were issued by the inventor's enemies, whose interest it was to omit such details; and that, at any rate, Schoeffer (Gutenberg's enemy) speaks (in 1468) of Johan (Gutenberg) as one of the *prothocaramatici librorum* of Mentz.

These explanations, however, are lame and unsatisfactory in every respect (chap. xvii.); and so we ask whether this silence is not much better accounted for by what the *Cologne Chronicle* of 1499 says, by the mouth of Ulrich Zell (the famous Cologne printer, and a disciple of the early Mentz school): namely, that the *Donatuses*, printed in Holland before there was any printing done in Mentz, were the models, the *beginning* of the Mentz printing, and that all that the latter town could lay claim to was that it had *perfected* the art of printing? Oh no, it is said, Zell has altogether been mistaken; he meant *xylographically* printed *Donatuses* (chap. xiii., xv.), and even these were not printed in Holland, but in Flanders (chap. xv.). Or, if Zell meant *typographically* printed *Donatuses*, and if he did mean *Holland*, he was an enemy of Gutenberg (chap. xv.), and, therefore, invented this story in order to injure his reputation.

We now begin to smile, for the very persons who charge Zell, in this particular case, with gross inaccuracy or ignorance, and even with deliberate falsehood, simply for the sake of venting his supposed spite against Gutenberg, tell us, in another place, that Zell is such a high authority on all matters connected with printing that, for instance, his testimony as to the date of Mentz printing (1450) must be accepted as Gospel-truth. Thereupon people tell us that Zell did not suggest the passage about the Dutch *Donatuses*, forgetting at the same time that if Zell did not suggest it, somebody else must have done it, for it is printed in the *Cologne Chronicle*, and it could hardly be fathered on the compiler of the *Chronicle*, as he himself says that he had his account from Zell.

We then ask further what is to be done with the genuine entries in the Diary of the Abbat of Cambray, from which it appears that he, in 1446 and 1451, bought copies of the *Doctrinale* which were printed *typographically* (*jette en molle*)? Are we not to apply those entries to the *Doctrinales* printed in Holland? There was admittedly no printing at Mentz so early as 1446, and there exist admittedly no *Doctrinales* to which the entries could refer, except those printed in Holland in the same types as the *Donatuses* of which we have spoken before. Oh, it is answered, the *Doctrinales* which the Abbat of Cambray bought were not printed typographically but from wooden blocks (xylographically). But, we rejoin, the phrase "*jette en molle*" is exclusively applied, from 1474 till the present day, to typographically printed books. The reply is that in the *one* case of the Abbat of Cambray it must refer to xylography, and that afterwards this technical phrase was transferred to the language of typography. We ask again whether xylographic *Doctrinales* have ever

been heard of, and whether any such *Doctrinales* or fragments of them are known to exist. The answer is, No.

It begins to be clear that these answers are not calculated to establish Gutenberg's case. But we have a few more questions to ask: (1) What is to be done with the account of Hadrianus Junius with respect to the Haarlem claims to the honour of the invention (chap. xiii.-xvi.), which is an independent and a very circumstantial account, every particular of which has been found to be accurate, except the wooden types of the *Speculum*, the theft of Coster's types and the precise date of the invention, three points as to which we have for the present no adequate information, but which have, as yet, not been proved to be inaccurate. This account, moreover, remarkably agrees with that of Zell, in that it bases the Haarlem claims on two books printed in the same types as the *Donatuses* which we may fit into Zell's account. The answer that we receive is: all that Junius relates is a falsehood, a fiction, a fable, a myth. (2) What is to be done with the earlier allusions of Van Zuren and Coornhert to an invention of printing at Haarlem? All this is again a fiction, a falsehood. (3) What is to be done with the pedigree of 1520 (chap. xvi.), made for an inhabitant of Haarlem who gloried in being a descendant of Lourens Janszoon Coster, the Haarlem inventor of printing, on which we find inscribed, not bombastic phrases of family pride, but the simple and homely assertion that Lourens Janszoon Coster "brought the first print into the world"? The answer is: the pedigree is a fabrication, or if it is genuine (and most of its particulars are correct, though one or two we cannot as yet explain), the assertion inscribed on it is a fabrication, a falsehood invented for the sake of exalting the family of Gerrit Thomaszoon for whom it was made.

We might here again ask why any man should deem it a source of pride to descend from a person "who brought the first print into the world," more especially if the assertion were not true and might easily have been replaced by some more ambitious phrase. But we now know enough. We see that the tradition of Gutenberg being the inventor of printing is not based on any book nor on any trustworthy testimony; that it can be traced (chap. xvii.), in the first instance, to himself only, or to the talk he indulged in in the St. Victor Monastery, near Mentz, and to two of his relatives, one of whom does not speak of it before the end of the fifteenth century, nearly thirty years after Gutenberg's death, whereas the other relative (Ivo Wittig) does not say a word about it until 1504. We see also that before 1468 neither Gutenberg himself, nor any of his German or Mentz contemporaries, when they speak in public, seem to know anything about it; that the earliest assertion (1468) of an invention of printing in Germany comes to us, not from Germany, but from Italy, and the earliest mention of Gutenberg's name (1472) from France; that the claims of Germany and Gutenberg are contradicted so early as 1499 by a German printer, in a work of considerable authority, especially in a matter of this kind; and finally we realise that if the tradition, in spite of all these damaging drawbacks, is to be maintained, it can only be done (1) by applying extraordinary and altogether illogical modes of interpretation to the *Cologne Chronicle*, and to the entries of the Abbat of Cambray; (2) by the violation of all rules of fair and reasonable bibliography, asserting that a set of German books are printed about 1454 and earlier, and that another, an entirely similar, or rather more primitive, set of Dutch books are printed about

1471 and later; (3) by casting wholesale imputations of falsehood, deceit, and bad faith on those who assert or believe that the invention of printing took place at Haarlem.

On the other hand, the believers in the Haarlem claims need not cast the slightest imputation on those who were the first to think or assert that the invention was made in Germany, or at Mentz, or by Gutenberg; they need not explain away anything in that tradition; they need not exert their ingenuity to find plausible explanations for it; they merely have to trace the Gutenberg tradition or rumour to its origin, and its hollowness is exposed. At this point they need but gather up all the testimonies in Dutch and German (the *Cologne Chroniele*) history as to an invention of printing in Holland, and place these testimonies side by side with the books (the *Costeriana*) on which these testimonies are based, and they will find that these books perfectly agree, both as regards their internal and external appearance, with the assertion that they are the first fruits of *the art of printing with movable metal types*, and should be dated not later than 1446-1474.

It is, of course, quite reasonable to remark how it could be possible that, if the invention of printing had taken place at Haarlem, no one should have heard anything about it. It would be still more reasonable to remark how a printer could have lived at Haarlem, or anywhere else, for nearly forty years, without his becoming known or being mentioned in history, as a printer, in some more authentic way than the reputed Haarlem inventor Laurens Janszoon Coster. But I think that any observation of this kind might first be met by a reference to the absolute silence not only in Germany, but at Mentz itself, as to an invention and an inventor, though there is not only no secrecy there about the art of printing, but the new art is publicly and distinctly advertised. Some bibliographers and authors on the invention of printing, sometimes speak of a desire of the Mentz printers to sell their products as manuscripts. Nothing could be more hopeless than such a suggestion. We know, in the first place, that printing, or let me say the publication of printed documents and books, could not have commenced at Mentz earlier than 1454, and already so early as 1456, or at least so early as 14 August, 1457, Fust and Schoeffer openly and plainly proclaimed, that they *printed* by a "nova ars" and an "adinventio artificiosa imprimendi ac caracterizandi absque calami ulla exaratione." Could a plainer statement as to the new books not being manuscripts be made or desired? But it is just the silence which reigned and continued to reign at Haarlem, that should be regarded as the strongest argument in favour of this place. In notes, found among Mr. Bradshaw's papers after his death, we read:

"The *anonymous* character of the art was not in consequence of any desire for secrecy, but merely a continuation of the habit observable in copying written books—it was thought of greater importance to supply the book than to glorify the producer of it, until the printer's name itself came to have a market value."

This utterance is remarkable; it coincides with what I myself have said above (on p. 49 sq.) on the absence of colophons in the *Costeriana*, without my knowing anything of Mr. Bradshaw's remarks. I do not think that he believed in the Haarlem claims, but there would be no point in the clear words which I have quoted above, unless we assume that printing was done somewhere before it reached Mentz, as we could not, by any possibility, speak of the art being *anonymous* at Mentz.

INDEX.

- Abecedarium (MSS.), 15.
 — (Costerian), 32, 36, 51, xiv.
Academy (London serial), 18, 33.
 Adinventio, 62.
 Alost, 18.
 Alphabet in figures (block-book), 16.
 Amen Corner, 15.
 Andreas, Johannes, 65.
 Anopisthographic printing, 16, 26, 39
 sqq., 41, 70, 73.
 Anscarus (= Gensfleisch), 68.
 Apocalypse (block-wood), 16.
 Aquino, Thomas de, Summa de arti-
 culis fidei, 22.
 Arabic numerals, 56.
 Archbishop of Mentz. *See Mentz*.
 Ars memorandi (block-book), 16.
 Ars moriendi (block-book), 16, 49.
 Asher & Co., 29.
 Augsburg, press at, 17.
 Ave Maria Lane, 15.

 Bamberg, press at, 17.
 Basle, press at, 17; printers at, 67.
 Batavia by Junius, possible errors in,
 74.
 Bechtermünze, N., at Eltville, 7, 8; (and
 Henry) 22, 71.
 Behem, Franz, 68.
 Berestyn, family of, 32.
 Bergellanus, Arnold, 6, 68.
 Berjeau, I., on Biblia Pauperum, 38;
 on Speculum, 43.
 Berlin, Speculum in Royal Library,
 25; Mary engraving in Museum
 at, 49.
 Bernard, Aug., 38, 43, 56, 74.
 — De l'Origine de l'Imprimerie, 25,
 32.
 Bernardus, S., Floretus (MSS. of), 15.
 Berona, press at, 17.
 Berthold von Hanau, servant of Gu-
 tenberg, 67, 68.
 Bessarion, Epistolæ, 20.
 Bethany, convent of, 16.
 Bible, 36-line, 17, 19, 21, 22, 35, 45, 48,
 50, 60, 61, 76.
 — (Mazarine) 42-line, 17, 19, 22, 46,
 50, 76.
 — of 1460, by Mentelin, 17, 37.

 Biblia Pauperum (block-book), 16, 38,
 49.
 Binder's waste, at Utrecht, 35; 39.
 Black-letter writing, 15.
 Blades, William, 2; quoted 20, 23, 24,
 38.
 Block-books, 14, 41, 50, 70, 72; often
 printed by private persons, 16, 58;
 German and Netherlandish, 16;
 various opinions as to their date,
 38; their peculiarities, 49.
 Block printing, 15.
 Bodemann, Incunabeln, 25, 26.
 Bodmann, his forgeries, 8 (*Note*).
 Bologna, press at, 17.
 Bonemontanus, Joh., 67, 68. *See also*
Gutenberg.
 Boner's Edelstein, 17, 21.
 Book-hand of 15th century, 14.
 Books before 1500, thorough study of,
 69.
 Bradshaw, Henry, 34, 40, 72.
 — and Haarlem Legend, 2.
 — on anopisthographic printing,
 40; on silence of early printers, 79.
 — on Utrecht as birth-place of Cos-
 teriana, 34.
 Briefmalers, 16.
 Briefs, or single sheets, 16.
 British Museum Library, 13, 16, 20;
 Speculum in, 25, 44; Donatus in,
 27, 40; Laur. Vallæ Facetiæ, 28;
 Lud. de Roma, 29; Saliceto, 29,
 39, 40; Pindarus, 31; Donatuses
 in 36-line Bible type, 45, 46.
 Bruges, Doctrinale bought at, in 1446,
 46.
 Brunnen, (or Fons) Joh., 64, 65.
 Brunswick, 35.
 Brussels, Legend of S. Servatius, in
 Royal Library, 16; Speculum in do.,
 26; a (Costerian) Liturgical book,
 27, 35, 40.

 Cambray, Abbat of. *See Robert* (Jean
 le).
 Campbell, M. F. A. G., 5, 32, 34, 51.
 — Annales de la Typ. Neerl., 24,
 25, &c., 30, 33, 34, 35, 36 (*Note*), 40,
 51.

- Canceled, 41.
 Cantica (Mentz), of 42 lines, 50.
 Canticum Canticorum, 16, 49.
 Carlsruhe, books at, 67.
 Caroline Minuscule, 15, 19.
 Catchwords, 23, 70.
 Catholicon of 1460, 17, 21, 22, 39, 45, 62, 73, 76, 77; Colophon, 62.
 Cato's Disticha (Costerian), 28, 31, 51.
 — Distichs, MSS. of, 15.
 Caxton, William, 18, 20, 23, 39; his Chess-book, 23.
 Chappe, Paulinus, 35.
 Chaucer quoted for "printe," 16.
 Church-hand of 15th century, 15.
 Cicero's Epistles, 19.
 Cicero Officia of 1472, 20.
 Cisianus, 21.
 Cohn, M., vellum Costeriana, 29.
 Cologne, press at, 17, 54; Costerian Doctrinales at, 28, 31; do. Donatuses, 29, 30, 31, 35, 40; regarded by Van der Linde as the home of the Costeriana, 36 (*Note*); Chronicle 1499, testimony of, 13, 47, 52 sqq., 54, 55, 59, 73, 75, 77, 78; contradictions in, 53.
 Colophons of first printed books, 62.
 — absent in Costeriana, 49, 50, 72, 79.
 Conjunctiones solis et lunæ of 1457, 21.
 Conrad du Moulin. *See Moulin*.
 Conway, W. M., Woodcutters of the Netherlands, 16, 25.
 Coornhert, 74, 78.
 Cornelis the bookbinder, waste leaves of, 27, 36, 74.
 Coster, Laur Janszoon, 5, 13, 24, 27, 33, 34, 38, 51, 56 sqq.; confused with a person called Laurens Janszoon, 12, 58; not a "myth," 57; his name in the Haarlem Archives, 10; his genealogy, 56, 74, 78; as Chandler and Innkeeper, 58; his story still believed in, 13; arguments in favour of his claim, 74; his types made in imitation of MSS., 49; his claim, 74, 76, 79; his types stolen, 74, 78.
 Costeriana, 24 sqq.; dates when printed, 37 sqq.; 44 sqq.; 70 sqq.; numerous editions on vellum, 51, 72; were printed not earlier than circa 1446, 52-56; but not later than 1474, 44 sqq., 48; said to be *not* printed before 1471, 38; vellum copy scraped, 30; difficulties in dating them, 44; may be ranked with German Incunabula, 52; *not* printed at Utrecht, 33, 34, 49; can only be ascribed to Haarlem, 47, 48; the peculiarity of their types, 49; certainly Dutch, 49; without colophons, 49, 50; how to be grouped 69 sqq.; could they be attributed to four different printers, 71 sqq.
 Cov. 15.
 Cracovia, Matth. de, Tractatus rationis, 22.
 Creed Lane, 15.
 Cremona, press at, 17.
 Cusa. *See Nicolas*.
 Cyprus, 17.
 Darmstadt Prognostication, 38.
 Date, first printed date 1454, 17, 73; of Costeriana, 44 sqq., 48, 58, 70; assigned to Incunabula, 38.
 Dating books which bear no date, 37.
 Decretals of 1473, 68.
 Delft, 35.
 Deventer, 35.
 Doctrinale, 45, 46, 47, 48, 51, 52, 55, 56, 70; bought at Bruges in 1445, 46, 47, 56, 74; at Valenciennes in 1451, 46, 47, 56, 74; jetté en molle, 77; MSS. of, 15; early copies (Costerian) of, 28, 30, 31, 33, 74; on vellum, 51; xylographic, 47, 77.
 Dominicalia, 56.
 Donatus, MSS. of, 15; of 1340 (?), 56; editions printed in Holland, 13, 27-33, 36, 37, 39 sqq., 45, 46, 47; (the *Cologne Chronicle* on Donatus printed in Holland), 48, 54, 55, 59, 60, 61, 70, 72, 73, 74; in French, 33; twenty editions attributed to Coster, 27-33, 70, 71; to Gutenberg, 21, 45, 50, 52, 54, 71, 72, 76; printed by Schoeffer, 46, 50, 52, 54, 55, 61, 71, 72; on vellum, 51, 72; on paper and vellum, 73; at Utrecht, 28; xylographic, 53, 55; anopisthographic, 39, 40, 41; a miraculous Donatus, attributed to Gutenberg, 60 sq.; of Sweynheym and Pannarts, 71.
 Dotendantz (block-book), 16.
 Drach, Peter, of Spire, 8 (*Note*).
 Dutch Spectator, 2; typography, block-books and MSS., 49.
 Duverger, —, 60.
 Eltville, press at, 7, 17, 22, 23.
 Encyclopædia Britannica, 10.
 Enndchrist (block-book), 16, 20.
 Ennen, L., Katalog der Incunab. zu Köln, 25.
 Enschedé (Costeriana), 27, 28, 32.
 — Speculum belonging to, 26.
 Epistelen ende Evangelien, in Dutch, of 1481, 34.
 Erfurt, 35.
 Esslingen, press at, 17.
 Facetus, supplement to Cato's Distichs, 15.
 Ferrara, press at, 17.
 Fichet, Gul., his Rhetorica, 20; his letter of 1472, 66, 67, 68.
 Flanders, 52.

- Florence, Pitti Library, *Speculum* in, 26; press at 17.
 Foligno, press at, 17.
 Fons, John. *See Brunnen*.
 Formschneider, 16.
 Fragments of Costeriana from old bindings, 36.
 Frankfurt, 17, 35.
 Freiburg, Mentelin's Bible of 1460 at, 17.
 French writing, 19; testimony about the invention, 66, 75, 78.
 Friedberg, P., 68.
 Fust, Johann, 65, 67, 68; his lawsuit with Gutenberg, 59-61; lends money to Gutenberg, 60, 61.
 — and Schoeffer, 17; their colophons, 61, 62.
- Gaguin, Rob., 67.
 Gallus, Alex. *See Doctrinale*.
 Gasparinus Pergamensis, Liber Epistolarum of 1470, 23; Orthographia, 67.
 Gelthus, Adam, 68, 78.
 Geneva, *Speculum* in Public Library, 26.
 Gensfleisch, Joh., 68.
 German writing, 20, 21, 49; printers, 23.
 Getté (or jeté) en molle, 47, 74, 77.
 Gothic writing, 15, 20; Gothic type, 18, 20, 69.
 Grammatica of 1468 by Schoeffer, 63; its colophon, 64.
 Gutenberg, 1, 2, 3, 17, 18, 21, 53-55, 60, 65, 68, 74, 76; a god, 60.
 — always quarrelling or borrowing, 68; as a vellum printer, 50; Bible and other books attributed to, 21, 35, 50; did not reside at Eltville, 20; said to have cut the types of the Psalter, 48; borrows money from Fust, 61; his claims as an inventor, 59-69, 75; claims contradicted in 1499, 59, 78; never publicly claimed to be the inventor, 75, 77; Donatus printed by, 45, 46, 76; consequences of assuming him to be the inventor, 76; his lawsuit with Fust, 59, 77; the Darmstadt Prognostication, &c., wrongly attributed to, 38; his invention a tradition, 75; his silence about the invention, 62; mentioned for the first time as "inventor" in 1472, 66 sq.; his invention merely a rumour, 67, and a tradition of the St. Victor Monastery, 67, 68, 78; can be traced to Gutenberg himself, 68, 78; is a lay-member of the St. Victor Monastery, near Mentz, 67, 68.
- Haarlem, the tradition of the invention of printing at, 1, 2, 9, 10, 13, 33, 37 sqq.; 45, 47, 54, 56 sqq., 59, 74, 75, 79.
- Haarlem Archives, researches in, 9, 12, 13, 49, 57.
 — Burial Registers, 11, 57.
 — Costeriana found there, 35, 36, 37, 74, 75.
 — supposed Coster forgeries at, 2.
 — MSS. just like Coster's types, 49.
 — silence about claims of, 79.
 — *Speculum* at, 25, 26; Donatuses at, 27, 29, 32; Laur. Vallæ Facetiæ, 28; Abecedarium, 32.
 — Town Library at, 28.
 — Legend (Dr. Van der Linde's), 2 sqq., 34.
 Hague, Royal Library at, 10; Dutch version of Penitential Psalms in, 27; Donatuses in, 27 sqq.; Lud. de Roma, 29; Pindarus, 31.
 — *Speculum* in the Museum Meerman-Westreenen, 25, 26; Pindarus, 31.
 — Doctrinale; Laur. Vallæ Facetiæ (Costerian) at, 28; Saliceto, 31.
 Halberstadt, 35.
 Hanau, Berthold von, 67.
 Hanover, *Speculum* in Public Library, 25, 26; Donatuses at, 46.
 Hartwig's Centralblatt, 8 (*Note*).
 Heidelberg Professors, 68.
 Hem, Den, Convent, and the Costeriana, 34.
 Herbst, Joh., 67.
 Hessels, J. H., translates "Haarlem Legend," 2; reviews Van der Linde's "Gutenberg," 3; publishes a reply to ditto, 4; references to his "Gutenberg," 22, 23, 38, 45, 46, 64, 71, 76.
 — writes for *Encyclopædia Britannica*, 10.
 Hibbert copy of Saliceto, 31.
 Hieronymus. *See St. Jerome*.
 Hinsberg, Jean de, 16, 58.
 Hispanus, Petrus, *Summula Logica* (MSS. of), 15.
 Holford, Mr., 25.
 Holland, Donatuses &c., printed in, 47, 59. *See also Haarlem*.
 Holtrop, 30, 32, 38, 40, 43, 51, 69.
 — catalogue of books at the Hague, 25 sqq.
 — Monuments Typographiques, 25, 38, 40, 49, 51, 69, 72.
 — on types of Costeriana, 72.
 Homeri *Iliada*, 31.
 Homery, Dr., 62, 63, 68.
 Humphrey, Noel, 38.
 Hyphens, 23, 70.
- Iliados Homericæ Epitome* (Costerian), 31.
 Illuminators, 14.
 "Imposition" of Abecedarium, 32, xiv.
 Incunabula, compared with dated books, 72.
 — Dutch and German compared, 73.
 — methods of dating, 37, 38,

- Indulgence of 1454, 30 & 31 line, letters of, 17, 23, 35, 39, 45, 50, 72, 76; types of, 19, 20.
 — of 1461, 22.
- Inglis, J. B., 26.
- Initials, 22, 23; initial directors, 70.
- Italian writing, 20, 21, 49; testimony about the invention, 65, 75, 78.
- Janszoon, Laurens, Lourens. *See* *Laurens Janszoon.*
- Jaqueré, Pfarrer, 28.
- Jenson, Nic., 23.
- Jerome's, St., *Epistola* of 1468, 65.
- Jetté en molle. *See* *getté.*
- Joannes (two), the prothocaragmatici of Mentz, 65, 68, 77.
- Joannes de Westphalia, 39.
- John II, King of Cyprus, 35.
- Junius, Hadrianus, 13, 34, 36, 45, 46, 47, 52, 54, 55, 57, 58, 59, 74, 75, 78; supported by Ulrich Zell, 46, 55; his account of Coster, 58; his "Batavia," 5, 9, 57, 74; a truthful story, 47, 48; his supposed errors, 52, 53, 74.
- Justinianus (*Institutiones*) of 24th May 1468, 63, 68; of 23rd May, 1476, 68; of 1472, 68.
- Justinianus (*Codex*), 7 (*Note*).
- Kalendar for 1457, 17.
- Ketelaer and De Leempt, 23, 39, 48.
- Koning (Jacobus), his work on the Haarlem invention of printing, 9, 10; his MS. note-book at the Hague, 10; his books worthless, 57.
- Lactantius of 1465, 19.
- Laurens Janszoon (not to be confused with Laurens Janszoon *Coster, q.v.*), 10, 11, 12, 57, 58.
- Laurentius Valla *Facetiæ* (*Costerian*), 28, 73.
- Lawsuit, *Fust v. Gutenberg*, 59.
- Letter-hand in 15th century, 15.
- Letters of Indulgence. *See* *Indulgence.*
- Libri Copy of Saliceto, 31.
- Liège, Bishop of. *See* *Hinsberg, Jean de.*
- Lille, Conrad du Moulin, Abbat at, 31, 37.
 — Convent of St. James at, 31.
 — *Speculum* at, 26.
- Linde, Dr. Van der, 21 (*Note*), 22, 34, 38, 42, 45, 47, 48, 53, 54, 55, 56-62, 64, 67; his blunders, 6, 7, 8; the "two graves," 11; repeats Koning's misreadings, 10; ignorance and want of research, 4, 5; a poor "pun," 5; his status as an author and bibliographer, 1-5; his portrait, 9; his list of *Costeriana*, 24 (*Note*), 45; *Essay on Mentz Psalter*, 9; turns his own "suggestions" into facts, 36 (*Note*); is very easy about the *Codex*, 42; his peculiar opinion about the date of the *Costeriana*, 45; a prolific author, 48.
 — "Geschichte der Erfindung," 1; his "Haarlem Legend," 2; his book on "Gutenberg," 3; on a MS. of *Speculum*, 35; on types, 48; cause of his expatriation, 2; appointed Librarian at Wiesbaden, 2, 3.
- Lines, unevenness of spacing, 22, 70.
- Liturgical Book (*Costerian*), 27, 51.
- Livy, German translation of, of 1505, 67.
- Lottijn, Janszoon (mistaken for Lourijs Janszoon), 10.
- Lourens Janszoon, 10, 11, 58.
- Ludovicus Pontanus (*Costeriana*), 29, 70.
- Lübeck, 17, 35.
- Madden, M., 34, 48; his free translation of the *Colophon* of the *Grammatica* of 1468, 64.
- Mansion, Colard, 20, 23.
- Mantua, press at, 17.
- "Manung" or *Almanac* of 1455, 17, 21.
- Manuscripts, various styles of writing in 15th century, 14, 72; the handwritings imitated, 19 sq., 22, 39, 49, 72 sq.
- Marienthal, press at, 17.
- Marsilius ab Inghen, 68.
- Martens, Thierry, 23, 39.
- Mary engraving, 49.
- Maturinus, 64.
- Maximilian, Emperor, 67.
- Mazarine Bible, 17. *See also* *Bible* of 42 lines.
- Meerman's *Origines typographicæ*, 25 sqq.
- Mentelin, 23; his Bible of 1460, 17.
- Mentz, appearance of printing at, 17, 35, 47, 48, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 58, 59, 60, 62, 63, 73, 74, 77.
 — Archbishop of (Adolf II), 63, 68.
 — claims of, 47, 59, 75.
 — *Incunabula* and their date, 44, 45, 46, 73; their workmanship, 73.
 — Library, *Donatuses* in, 46.
 — *Donatuses*, 45, 46, 47.
 — lawsuit said to have begun in 1449, to have ended in 1454, 61.
 — merry fraternity, 68.
 — printers at, 17.
 — *Psalter*, 9, 61.
 — assumed first mention of, in connection with the invention of printing, 63.
 — silence at, concerning the invention, 59 sqq., 69, 75.
- Mercers' books, 20.
- Milan, press at, 17.
- Mone, F. J., *Quellensammlung*, 67.
- Monreale, press at, 18.
- Moulin, Conrad du, Abbat of St. James at Lille, 31, 37.

- Movable types, first appearance, 17.
Muller, Dr. Sam., 28, 33.
- Naples, press at, 17.
Netherlands printers before 1474, 72.
Nicolas V, Pope, 17.
Nicolas of Cusa, Card., 65.
Nuremberg, press at, 17.
- Ottley, 26, 43.
Oxford Library, *Speculum* in, 25;
Donatuses in, 30; *Doctrinale* in, 31.
- Padua, press at, 18.
Paris National Library, books in, 17,
19, 23, 60; *Speculum* in, 23;
Donatus in do., 27, 28, 29, 30, 40;
Doctrinales, 31; Saliceto, 31;
Schoeffer Donatus at, 46.
— first press at, 17, 19, 39.
Parma, press at, 17.
Passavant, Le Peintre-Graveur, 16
(*Note*).
Paternoster Row, 15.
Pavia, press at, 17.
Pedigree of Coster, 74, 78.
Pembroke, Library at Wilton, *Specu-*
lum in, 26.
Petrarcha, Franc, de Salibus Virorum
illustrium, 28.
Petrus de Maximo, 66.
Pfister, Albrecht, at Bamberg, 17, 23,
31, 71.
— books attributed to, 21, 22, 35, 76.
Phil. de Lignamine, *Chronicle* of, 67.
Pindari Thebani *Iliados* *Homericae*
Epitome, 31.
Pius II, *Tractatus* (Costerian), 29, 31,
37, 44, 45, 70.
Plantin, Christopher, 65.
Pomerium Spirituale (Block-book), 16.
Pope John XXI, 15.
Pope Paul II, 65, 66.
Press, first appearance in many towns,
16, 17.
Printers, their use of waste sheets, 35,
39; the habits of first printers, 21;
types cut to imitate MSS., 18, 73,
Printing at Mentz, 75; its slow pro-
gress, 23, 39; used on one side only,
41, 42.
Printing Times and Lithographer, 34.
Prognostication of (1460, really)
1482, 38.
"Proto," meaning of, 65.
Psalter of Mentz, 50; colophon to,
17, 61; types of the, 19, 62.
- Quantity of type used by early
printers, 43.
Quires, books printed in, 7.
- R. printer (the), at Strassburg, 38.
Reed, J. B., "Old English Letter-
founders," 20.
Reutlingen, 35.
- Robert, Jean le, Abbat of Cambray,
46, 47, 50 (*Note*), 56, 74, 77, 78.
Roches, Jean des, 56.
Roma, Ludov. de, *Singularia Juris*,
29; a treatise on Canonical Law,
29, 33.
Roman types, 19.
Rome, press at, 17, 65 sq., 68.
Ruelens, M., discovery by, 27.
- Saliceto, Guil. de, de Salute corporis,
31; fragments in the British
Museum, 29, 30, 31, 36, 39-41, 50,
51.
Savigliano, press at, 17.
Schaab, C. A., 5.
Schedel's (Hartmann) *Chronicle*, 54.
Schmidt, Wilh., 21 (*Note*).
Schoeffer, Peter, 17, 18, 48, 50, 53, 55,
59, 64, 65, 68, 77; the colophons of
his "Grammatica" and other early
works, 63 sqq.; printer of the
Mazarine Bible, 46, 76; Donatuses
printed by him, 46; his claims to
the invention, 67.
— Johan, 67.
Schum, Wilh., on MSS. of the fifteenth
century, 14, 21.
Scraped Costeriana, 40.
Seven Penitential Psalms in Dutch, 27,
39, 41, 51.
Servatius, Legend of, 16.
Sieber, Dr., of Basle, 67.
Sigillatim, misconception of the word,
6.
Signatures, 23, 70.
Singularia de causis, 33.
Sixtus IV, Pope, 20.
Sorgenloch, Hans Jacob von, 5.
Sotheby, S., *Principia Typogr.*, 20, 25,
43.
Speculum Humanæ Salvationis, 24, 28,
33, 34, 37, 48, 49, 52, 54, 55, 69, 70,
73, 74, 78; four editions described,
25, 41, 43, 45, 50; woodcuts in, 34,
51, 73, 75; blocks at Utrecht, 34,
75; MS. of, at Utrecht, 35; when
printed, 38, 51; printed on one side
only, 39, 41 sqq.; a Dutch work, 49.
Spencer, Earl, *Speculum* at Althorp,
25, 26; Cato, 28; Ludovicus de
Roma, 29; Saliceto, 31.
Spiegel, the Dutch, 69. *See also*
Speculum.
Spire, press at, 17.
Stationarii, 15.
Strassburg, 35; press at, 17; earliest
date of printing there, 37, 45, 54,
63.
St. Jerome's Epistles of 1468, its
colophon, 65 sq.
St. Victor Monastery near Mentz, 67,
75, 78; Church of, 68.
Subiaco, press at, 17, 18, 19, 68.
Sweynheim and Pannarts, 19, 20, 23,
66, 68.

- Teyler's Museum, Haarlem, 32.
 Thomaszoon, Gerrit, 56, 58, 78.
 Tiele, Dr. P. A., 29, 33.
 Trevi, press at, 17.
 Treviso, press at, 17.
 Turrecremata de Salute animæ, 31.
 Types, books dealt with according to their, 72.
 — similarity of, 72.
 — succession of, as used by earliest printers, 19.
 — connection of, 70.
 — cut by the first printers in imitation of handwritings, 18, 19, 20, 73.
 — comparison of, 49.
 — of the Costeriana, 24 sqq., 49, 69 sq.
 — of the Indulgences, 20, 21.
 — of Sweynheym and Pannarts, 18.
 Uden (Costeriana at), 32.
 Unevenness of lines, 22, 70.
 Upright book-hand of 15th century, 14.
 Utrecht Donatus (Costerian), 28.
 — character of writing at, 48.
 — blocks of Speculum at, 75.
 — MSS. not the patterns for Coster's types, 49.
 — University Library, Costerian Incunabula in, 29, 33.
 — press at, 18; not the birth-place of the Costeriana, 33-36, 72, 75, 76.
 Valenciennes, Doctrinale bought at, in 1451, 46.
 Van Even, quoted, 16.
 Van der Linde. *See Linde*.
 Van Praet, 30, 31.
 Van Zuren, 74, 78.
 Veldener uses Speculum cuts, 34.
 Vellum Costeriana, 30, 31, 32, 40, 50, 72 sq.
 Vellum Costeriana scraped, 32, 39 sqq.
 Vellum used also for Mentz Donatuses, the Psalter &c., 72.
 Venice, press at, 17, 54.
 Verona, press at, 17.
 Victor, St. *See St. Victor*.
 Vienna, Imperial Library at, Speculum in, 26.
 Vocabularius Ex quo, collation of, by Van der Linde, 7.
 Vries, A. de, Lijst der Stukken, &c., 27, 36.
 Weale, W. H. J., on Van der Linde, 8.
 Weidenbach, Convent of, and Costeriana, 34.
 Weigel on Biblia Pauperum 38; a Donatus in his possession, 40.
 Wernher, Adam, 67.
 Wetter, Kritische Geschichte, &c., 25.
 Wiesbaden, Library of, 3.
 Wimpfeling, Jac., 68.
 Wittig, Ivo, Canon of St. Victor, 67, 68, 78.
 Woodcuts printed with text, 42.
 Wooden types of Speculum, 78.
 Wotanberg = Gutenberg, 60.
 Wyss, Dr. A., 8 (*Note*).
 Xylography in 15th century, 14, 15, 17.
 Xylographic Donatuses, 47, 53, 55, 77.
 Xylographic Doctrinales, 47, 77; unknown, 78.
 Xylographic Speculum, 41.
 Zell, Ulrich, 23, 45, 46, 47, 48, 52, 53, 54, 55, 59, 73, 74, 77, 78; his testimony, 46, 52, 73; the Donatuses referred to by him, are said to be xylographic, 77; he meant Flanders instead of Holland, 52, 53; an enemy of Gutenberg, 53, 55, 77.

BY THE AUTHOR :

THE HAARLEM LEGEND OF THE INVENTION OF PRINTING BY LOURENS JANSZOOM COSTER, critically examined by DR. A. VAN DER LINDE. Translated from the Dutch by J. H. HESSELS, with an Introduction, and a Classified List of the Costerian Incunabula. London (Blades), 1871. xxvi; 170 pages, 8vo, price 7s. 6d.

LEX SALICA; the ten texts with the glosses, and the Lex Emendata. Synoptically edited by J. H. HESSELS. With Notes on the Frankish Words in the Lex Salica, by Prof. H. KERN, of Leiden. London (John Murray), 1880. xxviii; 224 pages, 4to, price 42s.

GUTENBERG: WAS HE THE INVENTOR OF PRINTING? An Historical Investigation by J. H. HESSELS. London (Bern. Quaritch), 1882. xxviii; 204 pages, 8vo, price 21s.

ABRAHAMI ORTELI et Virorum eruditorum ad eundem et ad JACOBUM COLIUM ORTELIANUM Epistolæ. Ex autographis Ecclesiæ Londino-Batavæ edidit JOANNES HENRICUS HESSELS. Cantabrigiæ, Typis Academiæ (Sumptibus Ecclesiæ Londino-Batavæ), 1887. lxxvi; 966 pages, 4to, price 70s.

h

h

Boston Public Library
Central Library, Copley Square

Division of
Reference and Research Services

The Date Due Card in the pocket indicates the date on or before which this book should be returned to the Library.

Please do not remove cards from this pocket.

BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY



3 9999 06509 535 6

WY 3 130

